

THE
Monthly Repository.

No. CCXLIV.]

APRIL, 1826.

[Vol. XXI.]

Original Letters from D. P. Coke, Esq., M. P., to Rev. Gilbert Wakefield.

SIR,

Clapton,
April 19, 1826.

OBSERVING in the public prints an account of the decease of Mr. Daniel Parker Coke, formerly M. P. for Nottingham, I recollected that I had in my possession, two letters which he wrote to Mr. Wakefield, and which are now at your service. In the Memoirs of his Life (I. 301) Mr. W. has thus explained the occasion and the result of this correspondence :

"As the Parliamentary conduct of Daniel Parker Coke, Esq., had been in general conformable to my wishes, and as his demeanour on every other occasion within my knowledge indicated a man of spirit, sense and principle, I took the liberty of expostulating, in terms of considerable energy, upon the vote which he had given on the questions of the *Test Act* and the *Slave-Trade*, as unworthy of his character and accomplishments. He accepted my freedom of rebuke with a magnanimity that increased my good opinion of him; modestly confessed himself unequal to a discussion of those topics with me; and promised to weigh my arguments in particular, when those questions should be again agitated in the House."

Mr. Wakefield's two letters cannot, probably, be recovered. How he treated the subject of the *Test Act* will be easily understood by all who are acquainted with his just and liberal appreciation of civil rights. He has left a record of the manner in which he now argued against the *Slave-Trade*; and, to the continued exaction of Slavery, for which the *West-Indians* still contend against the interests of humanity, and probably against their own eventual interests, he would, doubtless, have applied the same arguments.

"Among other observations on the *Slave-Trade*, I adduced two unequivocal universal maxims, one *Christian* and one *Heathen*, applicable to every subject of politics, morality and reli-

gion, which admit of no confutation, and lie within the compass of the feeblest apprehension to conceive.

"I. 'Evil is not to be committed that good may come;' because the evil is *certain*, and the good *contingent* and *hypothetical*: and because the designs of the Divine administration and the happiness of mankind cannot be promoted by evil, that is, by the violation of those very laws which constitute the only means of happiness.

"This maxim answers, at once, every argument of *political expediency*. We cannot listen to the plea one moment. No political expediency, whose basis is *evil*, or an actual and open transgression of an express, universal, immutable and undeniable rule of rectitude, can terminate in national utility.

"II. 'Fiat justitia, ruat cælum:' *Let justice be done though the sky should fall upon us.*

"This indubitable sentiment furnishes a complete answer to all the suggestions of *probable inconveniences* that may result from the abolition of the *Slave-Trade*. Let these be as numerous and as formidable as you please, they must be encountered in preference to injustice and oppression. Comply first with the laws of the *Supreme Being*, and leave consequences to his management. He is very able to execute all the ends of his administration without the instrumentality of our wickedness, and is delighted with nothing so much as our endeavours to promote the happiness of our fellow-men, especially the desolate and oppressed. We are *then* co-operating with himself: for the grand design of his government is the ultimate felicity of all his creatures."

The Dissenters of Mr. Coke's acquaintance violating their principles of Dissent, by *qualifying* to procure the influence or the emoluments of office, appear, in the first letter, to no advantage. Nor is Mr. Lee raised in our esteem, while asserting that the

Test Act is no grievance to the Dissenters, and yet voting for its repeal, thus, to gratify his religious connexions, neglecting his incumbent duty as a Senator. I hope Mr. Coke had misunderstood him; for sentiments more just and liberal might have been fairly expected from an intimate friend of Mr. Lindsey, and a political associate of Fox.

J. T. RUTT.

*House of Commons,
May 28, 1789.*

SIR,

I received your letter this morning, and take the first moment to return you my thanks for it, and particularly for the latter part of it, because I am always ready to explain the motives of my public conduct, and think myself obliged to any gentleman who will give me an opportunity of so doing.

I certainly did give my vote against the repeal of the Test Act, and I never gave a vote more upon conviction in my life. No man is a greater friend to perfect liberty of conscience than I am; and if I could see the matter in any degree in the light of religious persecution I should abhor it. I feel that there ought to be a political union between the Church and the State, and that a religious Establishment is as necessary as a civil one: if that is admitted to me, I think it follows, of course, that those who hold the good things of one establishment should conform to the other. I don't mean to enter into argument upon the question; that is not within the compass of a letter, and if I did I am sure I could not find better arguments than those which, in your eyes, appear to be contemptible. I think Lord North's speech upon that occasion was the speech of a very able statesman, and I have been more than once convinced by the arguments contained in that speech.

Another circumstance happened upon that occasion which confirmed me in the opinion which I had formed. I saw Mr. Lee (formerly Attorney-General) in one of the committee rooms that evening, and was asking his opinion very seriously as a Dissenter, and he told me that he thought the Dissenters complained without cause; that they were not oppressed; and, that though he meant as one of

their persuasion to give them a vote, he thought there was no ground for the application. As far as my own experience goes where I live, I have seen very respectable Dissenters constantly in the habit of conforming for the common situations of Mayor, Aldermen, &c.; and, therefore, I suppose in general it is not understood to be a very great hardship. I certainly have not read the two books which you mention, but I think it probable that I might, after reading them, still be of the same opinion, because I consider the matter in a political view. I consider a very great question, which is now before the House, in the same way. I have the strongest wish in the world to be able to vote for the total abolition of the Slave-Trade; but if it is to be followed by the certain loss of all the West-India Islands, I will not vote for it in that case; and, at all events, I shall vote for every humane regulation which may tend to the better treatment of those unfortunate people.

I have great respect and great obligations to the Dissenters in the town of Nottingham; of course I have every wish to give the utmost indulgence to their application for religious liberty, but I think they have it already. And I only beg leave to add, that whenever I vote upon any public question, I never consider it upon narrow ground, as it applies to individuals, but upon great constitutional ground. I can easily conceive that this may be attended with considerable risque to me personally; be it so. Motives of that sort will never weigh with me; and my vote upon all these questions will be the same at the heel as at the commencement of a Parliament. I have taken the liberty of mentioning this matter to you with great sincerity and frankness, because I know when I am speaking or writing to a gentleman of understanding and a liberal education, great allowances will be made for a difference of opinion, if it is supposed to arise from mistake, and not to be founded in corruption.

You will pardon me, Sir, for troubling you with so long a letter, but I wished to give you an immediate answer. And I cannot conclude my letter without again repeating my thanks to you, for giving me your sentiments upon this subject, and for

doing it in a manner so very liberal and so very flattering to me. And permit me to assure you, that I remain with great truth,

Sir,

Your faithful and most obedient servant,

DANL. PARKER COKE.

London,

June 1, 1789.

SIR

I have just received your second letter, and am much obliged to you for it. I have read, and promise you repeatedly to read, your arguments, and to give them very fair play whenever either of the questions to which they relate comes on. You say you will excuse my endeavouring to answer them by letter, and I thank you for it, because I am not equal to enter the lists with you.

I thank you likewise for the ballad relative to the goal [Nottingham gaol]. I hope that dispute will not become serious, because I am very sorry to see neighbours quarrel on any occasion. Permit me, Sir, to say, that I shall always think myself honoured by your correspondence, and that I remain,

Your obliged and obedient servant,

DANL. PARKER COKE.

The Rev. Gilbert Wakefield, Nottingham.

SIR,

April 8, 1826.

THE perversion of the term *mystery*, in defending doctrines unsupported by satisfactory proof, and in obstructing the exercise of free inquiry, has excited in the minds of many rational persons so strong a prejudice as to lead them to wish for its utter abolition. Notwithstanding this unreasonable prejudice, I cannot help considering the word in question as possessing the same utility as other generic terms, by expressing in the shortest possible manner what would otherwise require reiterated circumlocution. It may safely be admitted, that the term *μυστήριον*, as made use of by St. Paul, refers, in the majority of instances, to the divine determination of extending the benefits of Christianity to the Gentiles; and I feel little disposed to controvert the position so gravely maintained by your correspondent, *A Nonconformist*, (p. 139.)

that what is revealed can no longer remain secret. But does that circumstance prove that the Christian religion contains no doctrine, and has revealed no facts too difficult to be fully comprehended by the human mind? In the usual acceptation of the word, *mystery* is intended to signify what is either wholly or partially beyond the grasp of our intellectual powers; and I must certainly venture to affirm, that not merely in every metaphysical, but in every theological system are to be found articles of belief which are partially incomprehensible, from the creed of the *supralapsarian Calvinist* down to that of the *simple humanitarian*. Without the slightest intention of shewing disrespect to his talents and labours, I may perhaps be permitted to remark of Dr. Priestley, that it would be difficult to point out any individual who, with so determined an opposition to the very semblance of mystery, united a belief of doctrines more irreconcilable with our ordinary apprehensions. In addition to the instance stated in my last communication, (pp. 3—5,) I might cite some of the opinions entertained by that indefatigable writer, as expressed in the preface to his "Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion." But inconsistency, I apprehend, prevails among those who consider themselves most exempt from prejudice and error in nearly the same degree as among other classes; and it must, at all events, be regarded as a failing, which it is more easy to discern in others, than to correct in ourselves.

It appears to me that your correspondent, *A Nonconformist*, is by no means free from this quality, when he complacently observes, "In the religion of the New Testament, I can find nothing mysterious." In making this assertion he evidently forgets that some of the doctrines which he firmly believes to be founded on the clearest revelation, are as mysterious in the conception of Unbelievers as those of the orthodox are in his own estimation. In truth, every Christian, to whatever party he may belong, must unavoidably yield his assent to what no understanding can properly comprehend, and no ingenuity can adequately explain. To say nothing of the resurrection of the same body,

and of conferring immortality on a material substance, does the believer in Christianity experience no difficulty in reconciling the scriptural fact that *few will be saved* with the infinite benignity of the Parent of the universe, and with the means employed for the redemption of mankind by his boundless power? Is there no difficulty in apprehending how the *final extinction* of the great majority of mankind, after enduring ages of torment, (believed by so many of the Unitarians,) can be consistent with the Divine *justice*? On this scheme also, as well as on that of the eternity of future punishment, the unhappy sinner might well be entitled to exclaim in the language of Young,

Father of mercies! why from silent earth,
Didst thou awake and curse me into birth?

And even admitting the doctrine of Universal Restoration, does the *strict impartiality* of the Deity, as asserted in the New Testament, perfectly accord in our conceptions with the sufferings which the greater portion of the human race will undergo previously to their final restitution, while a few favoured individuals solely from being placed in less perilous circumstances, will escape this accumulation of misery and will be rewarded for their unmerited good fortune with the immediate possession of interminable happiness? When I say *unmerited*, I say nothing more, I apprehend, than what coincides with the opinions of the adherents of Calvinism, and of those Unitarians who believe in the necessity of the will. Unless restrained by timidity from uttering their sentiments, neither of these classes of Christians can with any consistency deny that one portion of mankind, small in number, has been pre-ordained or elected to virtue and happiness, and the other, countless as the waves of the ocean, to inevitable vice and misery. Both parties, I believe, will acknowledge that this mysterious fact is really implied, if not formally stated, in Scripture: but who can penetrate the darkness which surrounds it?

Without dwelling, however, on these and other questions of a similar nature, can any thing, I would ask, be more mysterious than what we are

taught to believe respecting the agency of Providence? Revelation informs us that the minutest as well as the most important events are under the constant superintendence of an all-seeing and omnipotent Being, and yet how frequently do these events appear at variance with the Divine character as described in the gospel! Nothing can be more consoling to the mind amidst the misfortunes and disappointments of human life than the knowledge imparted to us of a *particular Providence*; but in no degree does this knowledge of the fact remove the difficulties that arise when we attempt to scrutinize the conduct of the Almighty towards his intelligent creatures, or to compare his moral government of the world, as far as it is obvious to our view, with the expectations which his revealed attributes would lead us to form. Notwithstanding the express declarations of the sacred writers and the numerous examples they have recorded, the concession of the incomparable Paley is most strictly true, that we must prepare, provide and act as if there were no Providence.

Of the justice, the impartiality and the particular providence of the Deity, there cannot indeed exist a moment's doubt, and yet there are mysterious circumstances connected with the application of these attributes to the condition and destiny of the human race, which the information conveyed to us in the inspired volume does not enable us to develop. In all cases of this nature, however, the conduct we ought to pursue admits of no hesitation. Where we cannot explain, we must be content to acquiesce. It is altogether unreasonable to expect that revealed religion should be in every particular level to the apprehension of minds so imperfect as ours; nor is there any thing to excite surprise that the vehicle of that religion should be found, in some instances, like the Cumæan Sibyl as described by the poet, *obscuris vera involvens*. Difficulties in the doctrines of the one and in the language of the other will still remain after the minutest investigation; and, as it is well observed by Bishop Watson, it would be a miracle greater than any we are instructed to believe if none remained.

I will conclude with an observation of the ablest female writer of the present or the preceding century, not inapplicable to the subject before us, and which occurs in the *Corinne* of Madame de Staël: "Sans doute, le monde, tel qu'il est, est un mystère que nous ne pouvons ni nier ni comprendre; il seroit donc fou, celui qui se refuseroit à croire tout ce qu'il ne peut expliquer."

CLERICUS CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Liverpool,
April 16, 1826.

SIR,

THE unwise proposal of Mr. Noah Jones, (p. 72,) to introduce tests and subscriptions to articles of faith among Unitarian societies, has met with that reception from Unitarians themselves which I confidently anticipated from their known liberality. Being myself one of that class whom he would exclude from the benefits of social worship, and whom he charges with inconsistency, injustice and mischievous intrusion in seeking those benefits in an Unitarian place of worship, I felt myself strongly prompted to make an immediate reply; but deemed it advisable, on further consideration, to await the result of his appeal to the Unitarian public. I have not waited in vain; for not only does his proposition remain unseconded, but calm reason and glowing eloquence, from the pens of persons equally sincere and zealous with himself in their profession of Christianity, have been called forth in opposition to it, and in vindication of those whom he attacks. Though your correspondents, Mr. T. C. Holland, (p. 156,) and the writer who subscribes "An Unitarian Christian," (p. 158,) to whom I more particularly allude, have left me little to urge on the same side, yet as it will naturally be expected that the objects of Mr. Jones's animadversions should come forward in their own defence, I venture, as one of that number, to solicit the attention of yourself and your readers to the following remarks.

In the letter, which has given occasion to this discussion, Mr. J. sets out with declaring that he regards the Christian revelation as the *only* source from which the human mind can gather satisfactory information respecting God and duty and futurity. He

then talks of an *immense gulf* subsisting between the Christian and the Unbeliever, and denies the possibility of any religious sympathy between them; from which language, coupled with the foregoing declaration, it would appear that he means to represent the Unbeliever as being necessarily destitute, or nearly so, of all religious principle. Does Mr. Noah Jones then really think that Natural Religion is a mere empty name? Does he think that this magnificent creation displays no evidence of an all-wise and all-powerful Creator? Does he see nothing of contrivance in the human frame? Nothing of wise order and beneficent providence in the grand movements and laws of nature? He surely forgets, in the ardour of his zeal against Unbelievers, that some of the wisest and best of Christians have strenuously upheld the truth and importance of Natural Religion, and that Paul himself is related to have declared, that "God hath not left himself without witness, in that he doeth good, and giveth us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." But if the voice of nature thus plainly declares the existence of God, it cannot be considered as silent on the subject of a future state; for the two doctrines, I contend, are inseparably connected, and the one cannot consistently be denied while the other is admitted. An all-powerful and intelligent Being, such as the works of nature irresistibly lead us to believe in, cannot be otherwise than a benevolent Being; for what conceivable motive can he have for wantonly inflicting misery? He must, moreover, have had a design worthy of his wisdom and his benevolence, in bringing us into existence; and such design, I humbly but confidently submit, is not apparent, unless we consider the present world as a state of *education*, intended to fit us, by moral and intellectual culture, for higher scenes of action and enjoyment in futurity. This brief and obvious train of reasoning, agreeing as it does with the leading circumstances of man's condition on earth, appears, to my mind, abundantly cogent and satisfactory. It may not appear so to Mr. Jones, nor do I require his assent to it in preference to what he thinks a better ground of his religious prin-

ciples. I only ask him to do the Unbeliever the justice to allow, that he *may* entertain the same views of God and duty and futurity, and with the same confidence, as the Christian, though on different grounds. If, allowing this, he still declares that with one so circumstanced he has no religious sympathy; if he still persists in placing an immense gulf between himself and the Deist, without at all regarding how the sentiments of the latter may be modified, I must leave him to the enjoyment of his own opinion, consoling myself with the belief, in which I trust I am not mistaken, that there are not many in the Unitarian body who are actuated by the same spirit. Were it otherwise, let me assure him, that the test which he proposes for driving the Unbeliever from their society would be altogether a needless measure, so far at least as regards myself. But so long as my presence is not considered as an intrusion, and furnishes no subject of reproach against the Unitarian body, I shall deem it my duty to seek the improvement afforded by the exercises of social worship among that denomination whose religious sentiments approach the nearest to my own.* Nor do I conceive that, in so doing, I am justly obnoxious to the charge, which Mr. Jones pretty plainly insinuates, of acting a deceitful part. He takes it for granted that one who is a Deist must regard Christians as believers in a lie, and pity their honoured Lord as an enthusiast, if they do not brand him as an impostor. Such thoughts and language I utterly disclaim. I honour Jesus as a moralist and reformer beyond any other name which history has transmitted

* Let me recommend to Mr. Jones's serious attention the truly liberal and eloquent letter of "An Unitarian Christian," (p. 158,) and the following passage of it in particular: "They, therefore, join our worship as less opposed to their own views than any other; they feel that they have the same practical duties to perform that we have, the same temptations to resist, the same God to serve; the benevolent and amiable light in which we contemplate the Deity, coincides with their natural convictions, and they come to us to seek moral strength for their virtue, and his guidance and blessing on their endeavours to improve."

to us, not excepting Socrates himself. And I think it possible to account for the supernatural parts of his history, without supposing that he either performed, or pretended to perform, the miracles ascribed to him, and even without impeaching in any considerable degree the character of the first promulgators of Christianity. Holding these sentiments, I feel myself no alien in those Christian assemblies where the moral doctrines of Jesus are chiefly insisted on, and where homage is paid to no partial or vengeful Deity, but to the common Father of the whole human race. I cannot, it is true, consistently join in *all* the ordinances of Christian worship; but my attendance on the *ordinary* services I by no means consider as a pledge of any particular belief further than what is implied in a desire for moral and religious improvement. If occasionally I am compelled to hear doctrines which are in some degree at variance with my own sentiments, what is this but what every one must more or less experience, wherever he engages in the exercises of public worship? The Unbeliever at present has no alternative, but either to attend in a Christian assembly, or to neglect altogether the duty of social worship. Can it be a question, except with those who deny the possibility of any religious principles not grounded on revelation, which of these two courses ought to be preferred? Let the case, in short, be fully and fairly considered, and it will surely require no very large measure of that charity which "thinketh no evil," to give the Unbeliever the credit of good motives in frequenting an Unitarian place of worship. For what can be supposed to tempt him thither, except the rationality of the Unitarian worship and doctrine? Were he really so regardless of truth and consistency as Mr. Jones insinuates, would he not exercise a little more worldly-wisdom in the choice of his pretended religion; and, instead of connecting himself with so small and unpopular a sect, would he not rather follow the multitude, and yield to the far superior attractions of a splendid Establishment?

W. J.

London,
April 7, 1826.

SIR,
MR. NOAH JONES'S letter (p. 72) appears to have answered the purpose for which he designed it, as far at least as inducing a discussion on the treatment proper to be adopted by Christian societies towards such Deists as attend their places of worship. Some of your correspondents have been very liberal of hard words towards that gentleman, and have endeavoured to raise a hue and cry against him as a persecutor. There is a great deal of this sort of language in the letter of Theophilus, (pp. 160—164,) and in truth there is not much else; not much, at least, which has any thing to do with the subject under discussion.

The question is this, Are we to welcome Deists into our churches, to speak of them as belonging to us, and to allow them to interfere in the management of our concerns? Is this the duty of a Christian society? As to excluding them from our places of worship, Theophilus and Mr. Jones equally know that this is impossible, nor was the latter so absurd as to propose it. It is to be hoped, that such as do attend may be the better for what they hear, but it is quite another thing to associate such persons with you in the management of a Christian Church. Many Deists, we are told, are highly respectable persons. Who doubts it—who denies it? But can they be regarded as fit associates of a Christian Church? Not unless Deism and Christianity are convertible terms.

It seems necessary in this controversy that the parties to it should come to some understanding about the sense in which the word "Deist" is to be used, for Theophilus tells us that the Jews are Deists. Now I use the word as it is used in common parlance, as descriptive of those who deny and disbelieve revelation altogether, Jewish and Christian, who look upon the whole as a cheat, who either believe Jesus Christ never lived, or, if he did exist, that he was an impostor. That is what I mean by a Deist, and Deists themselves must allow the definition to be correct. There is no medium. Either Jesus was the Messiah or he was a cheat. The Jewish records either relate truths or lies.

The prophecies were either real or fabrications. No man can believe a little of the one side and a little of the other; he must be either a believer or an unbeliever. What is called Anti-supernaturalism is the most absurd of systems. To deny that the miracles of our Saviour were indeed miracles, is to brand him as an impostor, and a person who can affect to believe in his Messiahship, in any sense, after this, must have a degree of credulity to which the records of Popish superstition afford no parallel.

Can we go to the Scriptures for a proper definition of a Christian Church? Fortunately we can. It is described as being "*built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.*" Now in such a community, what place can Hobbes, Collins, Voltaire and Hume have? Can a building which is composed of those who believe in the divine mission of our Saviour and those who deny it, be "*fitly framed together*"? And what can Theophilus intend by seeming to appeal to Lardner and Priestley as advocating such a fellowship as this? Where have they pointed out such persons as the fit associates of a Christian Church? But what says Paul on the subject? "*Be ye no unequally yoked together with Unbelievers.*" "*What part hath he that believeth with an Infidel?*" Certainly none as a member of a Christian Church, that is, taking Paul's description of a Christian Church to be correct. Loud complaints are made of the rudeness and illiberality of excluding Unbelievers from our societies. But is not he rather guilty of rudeness, nay has he even common courtesy and good manners, who thrusts himself into a society whose principles are the very opposite to his own? His conduct is this: after having deliberately rejected Christianity, after having renounced all subjection to and expectation from Jesus, believing him to be an impostor and his followers to be dupes, he joins himself to a Christian society, takes part in their meetings, throws out his sneers and scoffs against reli-

gion in their very place of worship, and if respectfully requested to withdraw from the society among which he is so unwelcome, so rude an intruder, we are to have an outcry raised against bigotry and illiberality. Such are the persons who have called forth the sympathies of Theophilus, the expression of which, joined with a great deal of personal abuse of Mr. Jones, fills nine columns of the Repository!

Theophilus is alarmed lest the Dissenters, by adopting the suggestions of Mr. Jones, should "introduce the demon of discord into their societies." Whether this demon be not rather more likely to make his appearance in a motley group of Christians, Jews, Turks and Infidels, than among those who

One common Father have,
One common Master own,

I may very safely leave it to any man's common sense to determine. For if one Deist may concern himself with the affairs of a Christian congregation, why not ten or fifty? Why should not the Deist propose a Deistical minister for himself and his friends? I am stating here no imaginary case. I remember the thing being done. In the case referred to, fortunately, the Christians were the larger number, but the "demon" was introduced by the Deists. I recollect also to have heard of a minister who, having renounced Christianity, very coolly proposed to his congregation to continue him as their minister. "Exceedingly bigoted," no doubt, the Christians were thought in the former case, because they would not indulge their "fellow-worshippers" with a little Infidelity. "Very narrow-minded" also the latter society was esteemed, to refuse the proffered services of a very clever and respectable man, because he did not happen to believe the truth of Christianity. There is a species of cant belonging to most parties, and this is Deistical cant. I certainly hold it very cheap, as I do the nine columns of Theophilus.

Mr. T. C. Holland says he has "reason to believe there is only one place in which Unbelievers take an active part in the management of the internal concerns of our churches."

Will he be kind enough to favour us with his "reason"?

A NONCONFORMIST.

SIR, Chatham.

UNITARIAN and UNBELIEVER,* it is well known, have been long used as *equivalent* expressions by a class of religious monopolists, who have *exclusively* appropriated to themselves the *Christian* name, an artifice which it is to be regretted has too well succeeded (as was no doubt calculated) in promoting the interests of a party.

For this *disingenuous* conduct let those who are responsible take the consequence, but forbid it that the members of our churches should ever rivet on themselves reproach, by countenancing that *improper* and *incongruous* connexion which your Todmorden correspondent so *justly* and pointedly condemns.

The general purport and principle of his *well-written* paper supersede any observations of mine, but there is one part of it to which I would *briefly* advert, and that not with reference to himself but to those to whom it deeply and seriously relates. He says, that Unbelievers listen to the discourses of our ministers with *complacency*. Does not such a representation excite a suspicion that *some* preachers are guilty of a dereliction of duty, and that their sermons are any thing and every thing but *scriptural*?

While I am bold to aver that there is not one among us who would any more than myself take his measures of the *gospel* from the *creed* of Cowper; yet is it without reason the *pious* poet complains,

"How oft when *Paul* has serv'd us for
a text,
Hath *Plato*, *Tully*, *Epictetus* preach'd!"

More than a bare hint is unnecessary, "*I speak as to WISE MEN*, judge ye what I say."

T. C. A.

* The difference between both is stated with *precision* in a pamphlet of Mr. Wright's *expressly on the subject*, and in Fox's sermon on "The Duties of Christians towards Deists," both of which I shall feel a peculiar pleasure in being permitted by way of note to recommend.

Critical Synopsis of the Monthly Repository for March, 1825.

THE PURITANS. No. I. Delightful. This correspondent talks well in behalf of our illustrious forefathers. Nonconformist antiquities are always to me a welcome theme.

The passage quoted by the Editor of Wood's Athenæ, does not, if closely examined, fix *The Learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government* upon Dr. John Field. It is not inconsistent with Mr. Fulk himself being the author in question. Field is said merely to have published the book; and though Fulk threatened to "confute" it, yet, be it remembered, he had now certainly changed his former opinions, and had connected himself already with the Established Church. His bustling anger at Field's publishing the work does not, therefore, tend to weaken the hypothesis of his being the author. The contrary perhaps.

In the transcript of the Dedication of Dudley Fenner's Sacred Theologie, is not *His Majesty* a misprint?

I doubt whether the establishment of the public debt, have, of itself, brought about so great changes in England as are generally ascribed to it. The increase of the mere monied interest undoubtedly has deprived "the country gentlemen of much of their consequence and usefulness;" but this would have taken place had the public debt never been incurred. The same money which is now productive in the funds, would have been equally or more productive in other investments.

American Unitarian Tracts. Of the two memoirs here mentioned, Mr. Thacher himself wrote that of Mr. Buckminster. The Memoir of Mr. Thacher's Life, was written by Mr. Greenwood, last Editor of the Unitarian Miscellany, and now colleague of Dr. Freeman, in King's Chapel, Boston. The defence of Dr. Priestley, extracted here by Mr. Taylor from the Miscellany, was also written by Mr. Greenwood, who, when in England, a few years since, shared a cordial intercourse, if not with Southey, yet certainly with Wordsworth, without suffering his Unitarian predilections and sympathies to be weakened. Let English Unitarians be propitiated

by the defence just mentioned, for any harsh feelings which may have been excited against America by the attack of Dr. Channing on Priestley. We Americans are very proud of the following passage in Greenwood's Life of Thacher. It is in the memory and hearts of thousands of our reading community, having been circulated in many a magazine and newspaper through the land. An increased pathos, a more affecting charm, is spread over the extract, when we recollect, that it was written by one who had himself just returned from a weary, and as yet doubtful, pilgrimage in pursuit of health.

"It is a sad thing to feel that we must die away from our own home. Tell not the invalid who is yearning after his distant country, that the atmosphere around him is soft, that the gales are filled with balm, and the flowers are springing from the green earth; he knows that the softest air to his heart would be the air which hangs over his native land; that more gratefully than all the gales of the south, would breathe the low whispers of anxious affection; that the very icicles cleaving to his own eaves, and the snow beating against his own windows, would be far more pleasant to his eyes, than the bloom and verdure which only more forcibly remind him, how far he is from that one spot which is dearer to him than the world beside. He may, indeed, find estimable friends, who will do all in their power to promote his comfort and assuage his pains; but they cannot supply the place of the long known and the long loved; they cannot read, as in a book, the mute language of his face; they have not learned to wait upon his habits, and he has not learned to communicate, without hesitation, all his wishes, impressions and thoughts, to them. He feels that he is a stranger; and a more desolate feeling than that could not visit his soul. How much is expressed by that form of oriental benediction, *May you die among your kindred!*"

Dr. Chalmers's late Volume of Sermons. O the wordiness of Dr. Chalmers! His paragraphs remind me of the bowl of soaped water which amused our childhood—a little grain of meaning being beaten up in a great

quantity of water, producing a splendid and beautiful array of glittering froth and painted bubbles.

A few years ago, this new volume of Sermons, by Dr. Chalmers, would have been immediately republished in America. But I have seen no notice of it here as yet. How much Irving and others, of the same school, have contributed to effect this decline of their master's factitious reputation on our side the Atlantic, or how much the absence of novelty has produced the same result, I cannot say. One William Craig Brownlie, a violent Scotch Presbyterian, now preaching in or about Philadelphia, has published a sermon most ridiculously imitated from the manner of Irving, and entitled somehow thus:—"For Missions: an Oration," &c. To one who knew not the real existence and character of the author, the whole affair would appear to be a broad burlesque upon Irving, written by the authors of *Rejected Addresses*.

Thoughts on Titus ii. 13. I cannot think Mr. Jevans has proved his point. There are various ways in which the glory of God may be made to appear, without an exhibition of his person. Does Mr. Jevans suppose that the real person of the Deity was displayed in the numerous instances cited by him from the Old Testament? Without resorting to the low, physical explanations given of such passages by Eichhorn and other German rationalists, how can an enlightened reader of the Scriptures understand the exhibitions in question as any thing more, than comparatively very faint miraculous manifestations of the power of the Deity? If, in a future state, we shall be indulged with perpetually new displays of God's power, wisdom and other attributes, coupled with new assurances and experiences of his love, our happiness will not be diminished by his eternally veiling from our knowledge the mysteries of his person.

Extract from Job Scott, the Quaker. Here are the conclusions of a strong mind, unassisted by the torch of true criticism, yet bursting through the darkness in which many portions of the English Bible are shrouded. The extract contains some accurate distinctions, worth any one's study.

There is something quite profound, in the remarks on the phrase *attributes*, as applied to the Deity.

Letters to Richard Baxter. How great was the reverence paid to Richard Baxter by his contemporaries! "Your name, Sir," says the letter of introduction borne by Sharpe, "has engaged him to this journey, and you will soon be convinced the high esteem he had of you was the only motive to it." "Pardon, I entreat you," says another correspondent, "this interruption given to your studies." I suppose that his talents and the state of the times combined to elevate him with many persons into some such awful personage as the Grand Lama.

I see no proof in these documents that "the most religious people of Kidderminster were dissatisfied with Baxter," or thought that he had "played fast and loose with the Church of England." The paragraph in which this matter appears to be alluded to, when closely examined, will be found necessarily to warrant no such conclusion.

Will some one remove for me a difficulty occurring in one of these letters of Mr. Rawlett? He represents himself as being still an officiating minister of the Church of England, in the diocese of Bishop Wilkins, yet is anxious to have his objections against subscribing removed. Could he already have subscribed, in spite of his objections? Or was he permitted to officiate, at the time in question, without having as yet subscribed?

May not the peer, to whom Baxter addressed one of these letters, have been *Powis*, who, according to Hume, actually interfered with success on this very occasion for Baxter's relief?

Dr. Jones on Philo's Christianity. The argument, when reduced to a syllogism, runs thus:—

Whoever praises and describes a Christian, *is* a Christian;

Philo praised and described Christians;

Ergo, Philo was a Christian.

Most persons will, at first sight, demur at the major proposition; many will doubt whether the minor have any surer basis than Dr. Jones's imagination; and so, what will become of the conclusion, is more than I can say.

Letter from Job Orton Much more pungent than his "Expositions."

Mr. Gibson's further Questions to Dr. Smith. Dr. Smith says, that Justification admits not of degrees. But will not our rewards be proportioned to our justification; and does not St. Paul say, that men will be rewarded according to the deeds, &c.; and does not according here imply different degrees? But probably I misunderstand the whole subject of Justification. I only ask Dr. Smith's patience and forgiveness.

Two Letters of Dr. Parr's. Worth two of Cicero's.

Testimony of Josephus to Christ. This is the kind of critique of which I before wished to see more instances among the English Reviewers. It is a compact, modest, faithful report of what the author has done.

A Presbyterian on the Evangelical Declaration of War. Absolutely unanswerable.

Mr. James on the Charge of Plagiarism. Little is the matter mended for Mr. James.

New Version of Isaiah's celebrated Prophecy respecting Jesus Christ. The title of this paper may to some readers savour a little of the assumption manifested in our English Bible, (circulated by the Bible Society, without note or comment!) which heads the first chapter of John's Gospel with "The Divinity of Jesus." For it is still, I presume, an agitated question, whether the fifty-second and fifty-third chapters of Isaiah actually refer to Jesus Christ. It cannot be doubted that some of the expressions must be violently distorted, before they can correspond with the circumstances of our Saviour's history, as related by the Evangelists. Be this as it may—how does the employment of a few particles in this translation undermine the common doctrine of the atonement, which receives so much support from the authorized version! I do not agree with the Editor as to the expediency of omitting the Hebrew and Welsh of his learned correspondent. As respects the Hebrew, why would not the corrections to which he alludes, be as interesting to his readers as the numerous criticisms and specimens of that tongue, which adorn almost every number of his magazine? Many of

us get or make no opportunities to brush up our old Hebrew, but such as are presented by incidental criticisms of this kind. And with regard to the Welsh, there are many who would inspect a version of an interesting passage of Scripture into that language with no little curiosity.

REVIEW. *Wellbeloved's Three Additional Letters.*

Dr. Priestley's "daring position" respecting our Saviour's misinterpretation of the prophecies, is too shocking for any Unitarian to defend. I would rather adopt the most far-fetched scheme of interpreting the Evangelists, or the wildest theory of the compilation of the Gospels, than one so much derogating from the character of Jesus as a heaven-commissioned teacher.

The "Canon of Suppression," by which the Archdeacon of Cleveland says that Unitarians would prove the Unitarianism of Newton, is a very good canon until positive proof is brought to the contrary. I presume that, in theology, every man ought to be supposed an Unitarian, until he is shewn to be otherwise; in the same manner as, in law, every man is presumed to be innocent, until he is proved guilty.

Bruce's Sermons on the Study of the Bible. Some parts of these extracts disgust one by an appearance of trimming, hinting at times a great deal more than the author dares to speak out, and breaking out into liberal conclusions at one time, which at another he would seem to shrink from.—Is Arianism such an heterogeneous, ill-compacted system,—or is the present author distracted between a sentimental attachment to the doctrines of "his grandfather and Haliday, of Drennan and Brown, of Mackay and Crombie,"—and the increasing light of the age pouring resistlessly into his eye?

There is a world of true, keen philosophy and noble liberality in Dr. Bruce's position, that some persons "have fallen under the suspicion of Atheism, for having more enlightened views on the subject than their contemporaries." Socrates is a trite though apposite instance of this. Suppose my God is an assemblage of hateful, tyrannous qualities, and your God is a negation of every thing hate-

ful and tyrannous; to all intents and purposes you are unto me an Atheist; and I will shun you as a dangerous Latitudinarian.

3, 4. *Brief Account of Unitarians, &c.* The author reviewed seems at once to possess precision and fire.

5. *A Scriptural Catechism.* Those texts in which Jehovah is spoken of as a Saviour, appear always to present him in the light of a preserver from *natural* evil. When Jesus is called a Saviour, it is as our deliverer from *moral* evil. In consequence of not attending to this distinction, Trinitarian word-catchers have persisted in maintaining an identity of attributes belonging to the Father and the Son.

Occasional Notices of American Publications. The special honour thus conferred on his country by a distinct department in the Repository, deserves a tribute of thankful recognition from an American.

Mr. Adam is too good and valuable a man to be deserted by Unitarians. There are few minds on earth so deeply imbued with the genuine spirit of Christianity as his. How willing he is to allow merit in whomsoever he finds it! In short, to give him no small praise, he appears to be a worthy coadjutor of Rammohun Roy, and quite equal to the arduous, though enviable, responsibility of being the first Unitarian Missionary to India. We could wish that he might have some quarter to look to for permanent support, so that his mind may be free from future anxiety on the score of his worldly concerns. He ought not to be allowed to depend on the merely *precarious* annual bounty of the West. If general Unitarian Associations in England and America cannot pledge themselves for regular remittances, let us form specific "Adam Societies" in both countries, which shall be responsible for the supply of his needs.

Poetry. To the Memory of A. L. B. If, in the second line, the tautological epithet *young*, or perhaps the whole clause, "young and fresh," could be exchanged for phraseology less coinciding with the remainder of the line, this Sonnet would be perfectly beautiful.

Had Mrs. Barbauld no "enemy" in the Reviewer of Eighteen Hundred and Eleven?

INTELLIGENCE. *Joint-Stock Companies.* I am extremely puzzled to know how this singular document obtained admission into the pages of the Monthly Repository. Having revolved it again and again in my mind, I cannot trace the slightest connexion it has with "Theology and General Literature." The only exception to this remark is, that one of the companies enumerated is a "Society for the encouragement of Literature," and another is the "Society of Scotland for Improving the System of Church Patronage." These two items redeemed, perhaps, in the eye of the Editor, the statistical and worldly complexion of the whole catalogue.

Since, however, it is before me, I will claim my accustomed privilege of inquiring, whether it would be a very impracticable or unwise project, in these scheming days, to establish a general Joint-Stock Fund, with a capital, say, of £500,000,000, the object of which should be, to purchase shares, or even to assume an entire interest, in many of the minor Joint-Stocks, which have, or are to have, a being? Capitalists would then suffer no trouble or anxiety in selecting the best method of investing their money, since that task would be performed by the Directors of the Grand Institution.

Bloxham,

March 7, 1826.

SIR,
MANY persons have asserted, and do still assert, in an unqualified manner, that it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin, and they seem to think themselves perfectly justified in making this assertion, because the assertion is found in Heb. x. 4. But, perhaps, the true sense of that passage is not generally understood. For,

1. Nothing surely need be more evident than that the patriarchs, Israelites and others, believed that the blood of bulls and of goats did actually take away sin; or was the divinely-appointed medium of pardon to penitent offenders. See Job i. and xlii.; Lev. v., vi. 1—7, xix. 20—24. Also, those that were offered at the beginning of every month, and at the three yearly feasts, especially on the annual day of expiation (see Lev. xvi.); and

by every individual person who had broken the law, before he could appear again before God at the Temple service. Numb. xix. 13.

2. It is readily acknowledged, that the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away all sins. The law of Moses forbade that atonement should be made for idolatry, murder, adultery, &c. &c., and all really presumptuous offences. But there are a great number of wilful transgressions which are not, properly speaking, and in the eye of the law of Moses, presumptuous, and which were never treated by the Jewish magistrates as presumptuous. This practice shews how they understood the law. If every wilful offence had been considered as presumptuous, and treated as such, what a field of blood their country must have been, and how soon it must have been depopulated! For who would, or who could, have lived under such bloody laws?

3. If the Apostle had asserted (in the generally-received sense of the words) that the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin, he would have contradicted, not only the language of the patriarchs and of Moses, but even his own words, for he says, just before, that is, at chap. ix. 23, that "almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is" (generally speaking) "no remission."

The fact, I apprehend, is,

4. That the Apostle means to say, that no one sin-offering could take away all our past, present and future sins, without being ever more repeated. And this is what we all believe; for the all-wise God never gave any one patriarchal or Jewish sacrifice such unlimited power.

And that this is really the Apostle's meaning here, I hope will most evidently appear from the words that are connected with them. See Heb. x. 1—18: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then" (i. e. if they could have effected so much) "would they not have ceased to be offered?" Observe, reader, that the last words are put as a question. Therefore, he says, (in that case,)

would they not have ceased to be offered? That is, if one single sacrifice could have been offered that could have taken away all their past, present and future sins, would not such a sacrifice have been offered, and so an end have been put to the offering of such sacrifices for sin for ever? But no such sacrifice ever was offered by any Jewish priest, which is perfectly convincing that no Jewish sacrifice was possessed of such very extraordinary power. That is, it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should in this peculiar sense take away sin. And,

5. That this is the Apostle's meaning, in the words under consideration, farther appears from his immediately proceeding to shew, that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ possesses this very extraordinary power. See from vers. 5—10. "Wherefore, when he" (i. e. Jesus Christ) "cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God.—He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will" (i. e. the appointment of God) "we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once (for all). And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make in those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." So it is said, in chap. ix. 26: "Now once in the end of the world hath he" (i. e. Jesus Christ) "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Moreover, that this is the Apostle's

meaning, also appears from hence, that he is, throughout the greater part of this Epistle, recommending the gospel to the Jews, by shewing them its great superiority to the law of Moses in many striking instances; and among the rest to their sin-offerings. Their sin-offerings were often repeated, but the blood of Jesus Christ, that was shed but once, perfected them for ever from all their sins. It is a standing sacrifice, the virtue of which extends to all sins, and throughout all ages.

6. While we, Sir, are disputing in these northern regions of the world, so far from the seat of revelation, whether the blood of bulls and of goats can take away sin, it were easy to shew, from very ancient writings and modern travels, that the native inhabitants of Asia, Africa and America, following the example of the patriarchs, who were their and our forefathers, are offering up such sacrifices to the present day. For amidst all the lamentable corruption of the revelation that God gave to their fathers, this fact is very conspicuous still, and in India it is very much so.

And lightly as many Christians think and speak of sin-offerings, the Jews think differently of them; and the more virtuous part of them, it appears, make more serious work even now of the annual day of expiation than many Christians seem to beat all apprehensive of. In the Jewish Expositor, for Jan. 1824, p. 14, it is said, "My father's illness continued four months, and it was during that period that I attained my thirteenth year; in consequence of which I was permitted on the great day of atonement to keep the fast of the month of Tizri. I was much affected by the prayer appointed for the occasion, which referred to God's searching the heart at the day of judgment; and in the public confession, when every sinner who is inwardly convicted of any of the sins which are there separately recapitulated, smites upon his breast, I was so overpowered with a sense of personal guilt that I left the synagogue, and in a solitary place cried to God for mercy."

"On the great day of atonement, when every Jew rejoices in the forgiveness of all his sins previously committed, and believes himself to

stand as high in God's favour as a Zadik, I alone was sad, for I was not sensible of the remission of my sins. My father, contrary to the advice of his physicians, caused himself to be borne into the synagogue, and there, sitting on his couch, performed his devotions with fasting and prayer." It also appears, from the Jewish Expositor, for May, 1825, p. 184, that it is usual for the Jews to spend more than ordinary time in prayer, for a month, before the yearly day of atonement; for it is said there, "A few of the elder boys were allowed to leave the school every evening at four o'clock to pray at the synagogue, as is usual on such occasions."

Can any man in his sober moments think that Aaron, God's High Priest, thought as lightly of what he had been doing at close of the great day of expiation for sin, as many Christians in our day think and speak of it? No such thing, Sir. It was indeed a day to afflict their souls (Lev. xvi. 29) for their past sins, and to propitiate the offended Deity by various ways, and, among the rest, by the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat, seven times, by Aaron, the High Priest of God.

Moreover, the blood of bulls and of goats being called a shadow of the blood of Christ, does not deny that there was any substance in the shadow.

P. S. The learned and sensible Richard Baxter says on Heb. x. 4, "This text doth not deny that the faithful Jews were then forgiven, nor that the law conduced to it, as used in subordination to the antecedent promise and law of grace, but without this promise the law could not do it." Baxter on N. T. in loc. It is not necessary for me to say any thing here about the antecedent promise, it being sufficient for my present purpose to prove that the appointed sacrifice was a real medium of forgiveness. See also on this text, Outram de Sacrif. B. i. C. xviii. § ii.; and the Rev. Geo. Hampton's Letter to Dr. John Taylor, on the Doctrine of Atonement, p. 50.

JOSEPH JEVANS.

SIR,
I PERCEIVE that the wholesome practice of excluding Arians and Socinians (as certain profane believers in the Christ are only too justly nicknamed by the advocates of a more divine phraseology than that of the Bible) from the Christian pale, is happily gaining ground in the tents of orthodoxy. A Christian then, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and exclusively, according to the definition of the present day, is one who, dissatisfied with the creed of Christ and his apostles as expressed in their own common-place language, flies to the more lettered vocabulary of tradition for the better understanding and promulgating their religion; worships a God who, by some perverse mischance, has no existence by name in the theology of inspiration; and prays after a model which, unfortunately, has neither prototype, nor parallel, nor shadow of resemblance, in the devotions of any contemporary of the first preachers of Christianity, or of its earliest proselytes. All this is, to be sure, as it should be: but, alas! alas! for this singularly Protestant, or rather, pure and perfect and only Christianity, it seems, *proh pudor inversique mores!* it seems to be only every day less and less popular in Christendom. From the *Jérémiade* of Mr. Haldane and other potent patrons of the Bible Society, it would appear that Arians and Socinians abound on the Continent; are even (can it be true!) the "major pars" of the subscribers and members of Committees *there*, of a Society professing to circulate, "without note or comment," the simple, unadulterated word of God. How out of joint surely are the times in which we live! That any but Athanasians should be nothing loth to send the Bible through the world without "*companion or corrective*"! And that in spite, nay, in consequence haply of such circulation, Trinitarianism should be every where upon the decline! O, is it possible? What! the Bible à *gros pas* putting down "Christianity"! Most strange, forsooth! Yet not more strange, if we may believe the evidence of unwilling witnesses, than true. In this dilemma, what must be done? O is it so indeed, that we must either abandon our Bibles or our "Christianity"? I

faith, though no Roman Catholic, I have long myself been very much of that way of thinking. Do advise me, Mr. Editor. The alternative is a most awful one for

A CHURCHMAN.

Mr. Emlyn to Mr. Manning.

SIR, March, 21, 1705.

I RECEIVED yours, and have perused what you say about miracles. I grant the common operations of nature, such as the sun's course, &c., are not called by us miracles; but I suppose 'tis for no other reason but because being usual and ordinary they do not raise wonder. For a miracle, whatever else it implies, must be *mirum*, else I don't see that the efficient power for some miracles is less than for creation, for indeed 'tis to create a new thing on earth.

Nor do I see but a miracle of some kind may prove a Deity, as does the creation (allowing that this latter is a numerous heap of miracles, and contains many more in it); from either we can but conclude, that there is a superior intelligent Agent, of mighty power, which, if it be the first and highest agent, is God; if under another agent, then that other is God; but some highest there must be to rest in. I don't think we can infer more by meer natural reason; but then what the Scripture may say as to God being the author, immediately of the world, or making it by another, is of further consideration. As also how far an inferior power may be interested in it, whether by a subordinate, communicated efficiency, or a moral instrumentality; to explain the philosophy of these things is above us, unless we knew how creation is wrought, and what skill it implies.

As to the difficulty that the Spirit sho'd first empower Jesus Christ, and then be subordinated to him, as 'tis possible the Spirit with which he was anointed, and that which became his vicar may differ, so if it be the same in both we have some resemblance of the matter in the angels who, one while, ministered to him, and legions of them, if God pleased, could have delivered him from his enemys, but after his exaltation they are under his feet.

Since my last, Dr. Sherlock has written for the Deity of J. Christ, with some new turns and strained flourishes. As to that text, Mark xiii. 32, he confesses the common answer, *viz. Not knowing it as man*, is not agreeable, but yet, says he, it must be the true one, or I know not how to find a better. He has run down the Bishop of Gloucester's late discourse about the pre-existence of the man Jesus Christ with severe censures, but has advanced a weak hypothesis of a pre-existent *eternal visible glory* of the 2nd Person that came down from heaven locally, by which he would answer such texts as speak of his descent. If I had opportunity I believe I might send you a short vindication of the Bishop, who also is preparing one for himself.* I find our Assembly is not like to hold long, so that I believe I shall be at liberty, but how I shall dispose of myself afterwards I am uncertain; 'tis like I may return and retire, after another year, if not prevented.†

Yours, in all sincerity.

For Mr. William Manning,
at Peasenhall, in Suffolk.

(Answer.)

As to the notion of a real *miracle* you agree it with me, (against the common opinion,) that it doth not necessarily involve in it the immediate efficiency of God to distinguish it from a wonder only, and I think that none that questioned his immediate energy and causation in the creation of the universe, or the needfulness of it, did ever imagine it necessary to prodigie;

* Emlyn's Vindication of Dr. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, was published in 1707.
H. R. B.

† Emlyn was released from his confinement in July, 1705. The fine of 1000 pounds, in consequence of the Chancellor's report that it was exorbitant, and therefore illegal, was reduced to £70. The Archbishop of Armagh was Queen's Almoner, and in that character had a claim of one shilling in the pound on the whole fine; this claim he was with great difficulty induced at last to relinquish for £20. Mr. Boyse was active and zealous in procuring his release. Mr. Emlyn, after his release, removed to London, where he preached to a small congregation without any salary.

H. R. B.

nor could after that prove his immediate operation in or unto any visible effect whatsoever, from reason or Scripture, in nature, or on the soul of man, that no second cause was the next efficient of it. In that you go beyond me. The finger of God is different. But now tho', as you say, any miracle must be *mirum*, as to us marvellous, yet take I not it so, as that a wonder and a miracle or prodigie are convertible terms, or that wonder at it enters into its definition. Spirits wonder not at the prodigies that they can effect; and for what you say, that some miracle may equally demonstrate the Supreme Deity with the creation. 'Tis true, on your hypothesis, without the restriction of *some* may; for according to you any thing existent alike may. Any house seen builded of some man, (the temple of old,) as well as the whole fabric of nature, while from either of them (alike creature effects) reason may lead up to a God. But neither of them will prove that the builder was God himself; or infinity of power to be necessarily exerted immediately by the architect or agent therein. A different power or potency of the agent you grant to different creature effects. I count of some far to exceed all created or communicated power as appropriate to the Divine Being. That a grain of wheat sown should multiply to an 100, implies more in the constitution of its first matter out of nothing, and of its seminal progressive nature, than the multiplication of 5 loaves of bread to an 100. Spirits can multiply and alter matter by their native power, when God pleases to order or permit the same. Whence, tho' I deny not the immediate energy and efficiency of God in some miracles, and to other effects, besides to the creation, the difference not being demonstrable to the light of reason to discern of the author, they can't *ex opere operato* in themselves prove the efficient to be God; the effect may be *aliunde*. Whence Grotius waved it in his proof of the Deity to the Atheist.

The question about miracles was occasionally started by me from our reasoning concerning the efficient of the old creation, and of Christ's instrumentality therein. A *moral* instrumentality in that, *viz. thro' faith*

and prayer, &c., I can't admit of. If of any, it must be a proper physical efficiency denominated of the Author or Maker of all things. Now I would not burden you with repetition, (as I am too apt to do,) but I can't get off where I was. The light of nature and reason I take to be sure, incontestable dictates in the point, touching the Godhead, (on which all natural religion is founded, Heb. xi. 6,) but never did any by the light of it, reasoning from the creation or things seen, (as they must do,) argue him to be God who made the world; if or except there was another first cause or higher agent unknown to them superior to him; but did positively conclude the *opifex mundi*, the immediate architect of it, giving being and order to it, to be the very God, known by them. The Old Testament witnesses to it also, I take it, thro'out, as I have told you, in as plain words as I cou'd frame no plainer, he, by himself, alone, his hand, his finger, did it. Himself appeals to men, Isai. xl. 26, xlii. 5, xliv. 24, &c. Do we any where find in Scripture such a claim of Godhead made from the work of any man's hand or creature effect? The New Testament, where we are sure the old creation is meant, speaks the same, Heb. xi. 3, 10; 2 Pet. iii. 5; and more plainly of the manner (as Psa. xix. 1) of our arriving to the evidence not only of the being of God, but also of the necessary existence and infinity of his power, Rom. i. 20, *viz.* from the *creation* derived from things made and seen. The Gentiles that owned (as all might) the Divine Being, centered in the immediate opifex of the universe, and owned none higher, when yet the apostle avers their knowledge of him that was the very God, ver. 21. And Christ to me speaks the same himself, *viz.* that not *he* but God made the world; Mark xiii. 19, created it.

I have only this more to add than I have hinted to you before of my thoughts upon the matter of a subordinate instrument, the efficient of the creation. I have scan'd Mr. Bidle's opinion (in his Confession of Faith) in the point pro and con against your notion of Christ, and for his own of the *Spirit's* agency therein. His (if any at all) seems to me the more accountable for, and of proof no

less looking that way. The H. Spirit none doubt of his preexistence. His agency in the formation of the birth of the Virgin Mary most own. His miraculous operations attributed to him as of his own immediate efficiency none will deny, and the Spirit's incubation on the face of the deep is as plain, Gen. i. 2 (the old creation we are sure); besides what else we find of the like aspect, Job xxvi. 13, xxxiii. 4, Ps. civ. 30, &c. Now I note that the Spirit is said only to cherish and dispose of the preexistent matter said to be created of God simply; but of Christ (if in the New Testament meant of that) 'tis said, that without him was not any thing made, John i. No not angels or powers, (all out of nothing,) but all were made by him. That is higher! If then I could admit of the latter, I can't see reason to refuse the former; much less to me appears against it.

Now then, if my former arguments with me will hold that a creative power will prove not a God only, but the immediate efficient to be omnipotent and very God, and your and Mr. Bidle's will hold of two such Creators, neither of them the Father Almighty, when I can discern of the latter I may incline to entertain of the B^p. of Gloucester's notion, (consonant to the Nicene Creed of a God of God,) *viz.* that the divine nature is communicable, procreative of two other intelligent agents, of the same substance in kind, nature and properties, however subordinate in their agency too, and not in all respects equal. While it sticks with me that Creators and Gods speak the same thing, equally as three omnipotents and three Gods do the same. And this arguing reduces me to that dilemma. The Arians all generally issued into it, having *espoused* the *former*, after centred in the latter, and so do to this day. But that God and Christ are *membra dividentia*, I can't doubt (1 Tim. ii. 5) on the notoriety of it, nor could I ever find a begotten Son so called in the Godhead. After all, while not only you (who may see farther than I) but so many other eminent persons for learning and piety and moderation and communion with God, I find confidently differing from us both, it stounds me, and I am

brought not to be over confident in matters so high as to myself, no more than to trust therein to the best of men, not agreed amongst themselves neither; and good people tell me that they can't solve nor answer to the texts alledged on either part to determine for themselves, but must follow some to guide them therein whom they rely on. We may be sure of something, let us hold unto that; I am in the dark about much more. In the stead of arguing more on those points so difficult, I might, had I opportunity, rather suggest to you some more sedate thoughts of mine (now after long experience) in the general, of what I am led unto, to infer and conclude touching the great uncertainty of human knowledge, the vanity of prescience, (the which Mr. Baxter on 1 Cor. viii. 2, 3, hath spoken so feelingly to me about,) and the just challenge of ourselves that we are left unto for our wast of time and strength in less necessary studies without profit, when we may live too, to discern our own errors in the issue of them, (tho' most secure themselves from change as to that,) or at least that our labour will be lost as to others, when our most elaborate inquiries, if left behind, shall be committed to the fire and no use made of them, Eccles. i. 18, xii. 10, 12, 13. While yet an inquisitive mind after truth will be working, (it were well if not irregularly,) and he that will spare the pains of search for it, chusing rather without more ado to take up with the common opinion or that of leading men, according to his birth and education, (different in so many climates,) will in the issue as it may hap center in the worse, and less accountable to God for his error (who will pardon a mistake that a man can't help, and admit of his apology). And 'tis no well grounded resolve for a man not to use his own eyes, or endeavour to enlighten them, for as much as they may possibly deceive him, when so may as well his trust to any other man's and with more danger to him in morals.

I cou'd be content from you to understand the Bishop of Gloucester's notion of the man Christ Jesus, i. e. of the human nature termed, tho' I care not to wast more time in reading or thoughts on that subject, only

to know whether he agree with you therein or with whom else, touching his local descent.

Let me go as neer as I can to discern of the truth, be sensible of my own as well as of others short sightedness, think my own way till further light, and own it, but not bear hard upon others in matters so high, and wherein the Scriptures are not so plain, but that men of the greatest eminence and value will adventure to lay down their life, (as they do constantly ridicule each others interpretation of them,) some to pawn that this, and some that the contrary is the true sence of them in those points (the light of nature, to me cogent, by most being overlookt wherein it may put a barre to mens construction). However, (not being certain of the apostles knowledge in what is left dubious in their writings,) let me be content with my measure, wherein I am sure all our measures are but enigmatical, childish and short of the thing, waiting in apparation for the time of the dispelling of the cloud, with more longings towards it. 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 10, 12; Eph. iv. 13; 1 John iii. 2, &c. Let me hold there.

For the Arian notion of the pre-existence of Christ respecting his Spirit, (no superangelick nature distinct from human souls,) I don't stick at that; however, if true, I know not why all souls may not be admitted as well to preexistence, according to the Platonists, mens incarnata, tho' difficulties attend it too, and the man Christ Jesus was of the same species of being with us, Acts xiii. 23, Heb. vii. 10, 14; and the texts brought are capable of another sensing, as John iii. 13, by Dr. Owen, and John viii. 56, 58, by Dr. Goodwin, &c.

SIR,

AS the Repository is one of the monthly journals which has obtained a circulation amongst our Transatlantic brethren, permit me through its medium to notice an article in the London Magazine for February last, entitled, "North-American Review on Lord Byron's Works." Having previously perused the North-American Review of the character and writings of Lord Byron, and having felt particular pleasure in the manly and liberal sentiments of the writer,

the enlightened and moral tone which pervades the whole of the article, and the accurate estimate of his lordship's real character and peculiar merits as a poet, which that article in my opinion fully displays, I could not help the sense of shame overwhelming me as an Englishman for the arrogance of pretension which the article in the London Magazine manifests. Its coarseness of expression, its frivolity and impotent attempt at depreciation, are, however out of keeping, to be excused, compared with the rantipole amusement that pervades the whole of the criticism. Whatever the North American depreciates the Londoner must extol, whatever the former approves the latter of course must depreciate. Even some of Byron's careless prosaic lines—and every reader is aware that of these the number is immense—because the North American reprobates, the Londoner is bound to applaud. The following is an instance: speaking of dogs devouring dead bodies after the carnage of the battle, his lordship observes,

"They were too busy to bark* at him;
From a Tartar's skull they had stripped
the flesh,
As ye peel the fig when the fruit is
fresh."

These lines occur in a passage pronounced by the Londoner "of wonderful power and fine though appalling effect."

In the present period of our literature, while extravagance of conceit has found extravagant admirers in Byshe Shelley, and nudity has been preferred to covering, or rusticity to ornament in Wordsworth; while Byron's garb of majesty has had fewer admirers than his night-gown and slippers—it is quite refreshing to appreciate the taste and critical acumen of the writer of the North-American Review. It seems to be formed on the standard of the Augustan age of British literature, namely, that of the reign of Queen Anne. Emerging

* This assertion is contrary to the propensities of the animal. When feeding at liberty and voraciously, dogs always bark at whatever comes near them, under the evident fear of being deprived of their food.

from the cradle of untutored nature, they, "the sons of the free," very properly turn for assistance to the handmaid of art. The Londoner professes to have an extraordinary relish for every thing that is natural, but unfortunately, like his fellow-cockney, who when potatoes were first brought to Covent-Garden Market observed, "they grew on trees like apples, but were dirtied by the hands of the rustics who gathered them," he takes not the trouble to separate what is really natural from the dirt or the crust by which it is enveloped.

This "Reviewing of Reviewers," now become so very obtrusive in almost every journal and periodical miscellany, reminds me of an occurrence in natural history which once fell under my observation. The leaves of a water willow, glistening with a recent honey dew, exhibited an innumerable quantity of insects of the *Aphis* species. The little animals nearly covered the whole of the foliage, and, with appetites voracious and indiscriminating, the liquid that exuded from the anus of one was greedily devoured by the mouth of another.

W. H.

On the Passages ascribed to Matthew and Luke; *Matt.* i. 18 to ii. 23, and *Luke* i. 5 to ii. 52.

SIR,

IT does appear to be of no small importance to the general credit of the gospel histories, that it should be determined whether or not the passages prefixed to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, relating to the birth and early life of Christ prior to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him at his baptism, were penned and intended to be represented by them as a part of their testimony, and that of the apostles in general, concerning Christ. The writer of these remarks is indeed ill qualified, in many respects, to determine a question of this nature, but as there are some arguments from these and the other books of the New Testament, and some to which he can refer from other sources which to his mind appear to be *decisive against both the genuineness and authenticity of those passages*, he cannot refrain from offer-

ing them to the consideration of your readers, sincerely hoping, that the subject may be again taken up and if possible brought to an issue by some of your learned and able correspondents. Much, it is true, has been alleged against the authenticity of these passages by a Priestley, a Belsham, and other writers of great talents and learning, particularly Mr. John Palmer, and a correspondent under the signature of Nazarenus, in the *Theological Repository*. But on the other hand, the authenticity of the passage in Luke has been defended by Dr. Carpenter; and while both passages continue to be inserted in every version of the Scriptures, the question respecting their authenticity must be regarded as undecided, if not upon the whole as preponderating in its favour.

The leading point on which I wish to insist, is the great and, as I conceive, irreconcilable inconsistency between the contents of these passages and those of the subsequent gospel history and of the New Testament in general. The many extraordinary particulars detailed, of which the greater number had for their object the annunciation of Jesus as the Christ, and abounding in promises of salvation and blessedness to the Jewish people, are inconsistent both with the subsequent narrative and with the events which actually followed. The miraculous conception and the other events declaring Jesus to be in this sense the Son of God and also the Messiah, would naturally lead his parent, with Joseph and many others, to adopt steps in his education and circumstances in life conformable to his high destination. But no such steps appear to have been taken or attempted; he is trained up in the humble occupation of his "supposed" father; he is not made acquainted with the learning of his age and country; and from the opinion of the Jewish people, particularly expressed by their leaders and by his fellow-townsmen, he seems to have been regarded in the same light as ordinary mechanics in general, and his whole treatment, both on the part of his friends and others, as far as is shewn by the subsequent history, was precisely the same as if no such event had happened.

If an angelic choir announced the birth of "a Saviour, Christ the Lord," to a company of shepherds, who "made known abroad the saying" in Bethlehem, at a time of public taxing, when that city was crowded with people; if the miracles and sayings respecting the birth of Christ, his precursor, and their parents, the anticipations of Mary and the predictions of Zachariah, were "noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judea;" if, in the words of Simeon, the great deliverer was "prepared before the face of all people," and if the prophetess Anna "spoke of him to all those who looked for redemption in Jerusalem," it must have been in order that he might be made very generally known, and that that knowledge might be productive of some permanent and valuable effects. And if no such effects were produced, but when the period of his entering upon the exercise of his office arrived all persons were estranged to his character and destination, those numerous miracles and predictions which had plainly for their object the diffusion of such knowledge, must have been wrought and uttered in vain; a conclusion which is manifestly inadmissible.

But that on the first preaching of John the Baptist till the descent of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism, he was unknown in his true character to all persons, is, I think, perfectly evident from all the particulars of the ensuing history: unknown to the people in general, since on the public appearance of John, "*all men were musing in their hearts whether he were the Christ or not,*" clearly shewing that they were strangers to both characters, notwithstanding that series of wonders with which they are just before represented as being introduced into the world; unknown to John himself, who expressly declares this to have been the case, till by the descent of the Holy Spirit he was announced to him (John i. 31, 33); unknown to many, and probably to all the apostles, till they were introduced to him by John or made acquainted with him by his own public ministry, it not being till after Jesus had preached and wrought miracles throughout Galilee, and thus made himself known, that he called upon

them to become his followers; unknown to the inhabitants of the town in which he had been "brought up," who knew nothing extraordinary concerning him, but regarded him only as an ordinary mechanic, (Matt. xiii. 35, Mark vi. 3,) with whose humble circumstances and connexions they were perfectly acquainted; unknown or discredited by his own relatives (John vii. 5); and, if it is correct as related, Mark iii. 21, 31, that his mother accompanied his brethren to secure his person, from the persuasion that he was "beside himself," or, in the language of the Scribes (ver. 22) "had Beelzebub," at a time when he was particularly distinguished by his miracles and discourses, alike unknown in his true character to her also. Observing "the parallelism of the expressions, *They* (his friends) *went out to lay hold of him, for they said he is beside himself. And the Scribes from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub,*" Dr. Campbell concludes, that "nothing appears plainer than that the verdict of the friends is the occasion of introducing the verdict of the Scribes in the verse immediately following." The connexion between the persuasion with which the mother and brethren of Jesus were actuated, and the verdict of the Pharisees, receives confirmation from the corresponding passage in Matthew. (See ch. xii. 24, 46, with the intervening and subsequent remarks of Jesus.) Now when this general and total estrangedness from the knowledge of Christ's character, extending itself to his most intimate relatives, and who are represented in the passages in question as the subjects of several of the miracles there related, is contrasted with the general contents of these passages, how can they possibly be reconciled? It appears manifest that the knowledge which they were directed to establish and diffuse by copious miracles, and in particular the supernatural wisdom infused into the minds of John the Baptist, of Mary, and others, had no permanent continuance, and was productive of no corresponding effects. What other rational inference can be deduced than that these stories were not founded in fact, being unknown and attended with no results in the age and

country in which they are said to have transpired?

That these stories are fabulous appears not simply from the particulars being unknown, but inconsistent with the subsequent history, which proceeds upon the principle, that the preaching of John the Baptist was the first annunciation of the appearance of the Messiah since the predictions of the ancient prophets. The office of John was to announce one greater than he, who was to come *after* him, whom nobody knew or could know, but as he was introduced to them by John as his precursor and herald, and by the subsequent descent of the Holy Spirit upon him and the miracles he would afterwards perform. It was that event which, according to *this* part of the history, appears to have been the introductory miracle which first made known Jesus in his capacity as the Christ to the precursor himself, while according to those stories they must have been intimately familiarized with each other in their true characters from their earliest years! It is observable indeed, that neither before this event, nor on any subsequent occasion, does John appear to have expressly announced him as the Christ, but usually employs some other expressions, such as "one greater than he, who should come after him"—"the Lamb of God"—"he that baptizeth with the Holy Spirit"—"he that cometh from above," &c., * and his subsequent

* On one occasion, viz. John i. 34, John the Baptist applies the phrase *the Son of God* to Jesus; and with the article prefixed, as in this case, it has been thought that this phrase is synonymous with the Christ. But as *without* the article it is applicable to all persons of distinguished piety, so its use with the article by John in the present instance was sufficiently authorized by the voice which he had recently heard from heaven, "This is my beloved Son." This circumstance, however, might not determine him to be the Christ, either in his apprehension or that of others; and it appears to me that our Lord himself on several occasions used this phrase without its certainly determining his pretensions to that office in the apprehensions of those who heard him. See particularly John x. 31—36. In several of his preceding con-

message inquiring, "Art thou he that should come?" &c., shews that he, or at least his disciples, had not yet perfectly understood his office and destination. Our Lord himself abstained from any express statements of his designation to the Jews, leaving them to make the proper inferences from his miracles and general language and conduct, and particularly commending the discernment of Peter in discovering, as well as his fidelity in acknowledging, it under the lowly appearance which he assumed. It was not till his public examination before the Jewish council that on being solemnly adjured concerning this point, he gave an express answer to what still remained a question even as it regarded his own professions. (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64.) The first explicit and unreserved annunciation of Jesus as the Christ before the Jewish people seems to have been left, till he was removed from this world and actually "exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour" in the heavenly places, and may be dated from the speech of Peter in these words, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts ii. 36.) The whole course of his ministry on earth manifests that he was then only preparing the minds of men for the acknowledgment of his sovereignty, which would not properly commence till his resurrection and ascension to the majesty on high, it being of a spiritual nature, to be chiefly exercised in a future life, and selecting as its members the spiritual and heavenly-minded, who by a course of instruc-

versations with the Jews, as related by the Evangelist John, he applied this phrase to himself; nevertheless we find them calling upon him for an explicit declaration "if he were the Christ," John x. 24; and toward the close of his ministry he gave a charge to his disciples that "*they should tell no man that he was the Christ.*" Matt. xvi. 20. Can such a charge at so late a period of his public ministry be reconciled with the many miraculous and public testimonials to him as the Jewish Messiah in terms which could not be misunderstood, of which we read in the passages in question?

tion and discipline become gradually fitted for that elevated state of being, and it was because Jesus had attained to a distinguished superiority in moral and spiritual excellence, that he was first chosen as "the beloved Son of God," and at length given a name above every name that is named. But how can this gradual disclosure of the Messiah and reserve of his actual elevation to a future life be reconciled with his being presented and announced to the whole Jewish people as such, immediately upon his entrance into this life? This would have been much too early a period to announce him as a Prince, whose office was to be exercised in this world by effecting the temporal deliverance of the Jews from the Roman yoke, much more as that spiritual Prince whose dominion appertains chiefly to a future existence, and can proceed only with the gradual diffusion of his doctrine and spirit among mankind at large. In truth, the accounts of so many wonders celebrating the birth of two infants many years anterior to the actual commencement of their respective offices, has all the air of fabulous romance, wholly inapplicable to the objects professedly in view, and which must rather tend to defeat those ends to be effected by the appearance of either a temporal Jewish deliverer, or the true Messiah.

The facts of the gospel history rest on the testimony of the apostles and other immediate witnesses, but that testimony commenced from the baptism of John. The qualifications for the office of an apostle, as it respects the period and particulars of his testimony, are distinctly stated, Acts i. 21, 22: "Of those men which have accompanied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Accordingly, if we except the passages in question, the records and recitations of their testimony are uniformly comprised within that period. It is here that the Evangelists Mark and John commence their narratives, the former expressly declaring this to be "the beginning

of the gospel of Jesus Christ," an assertion which would have been most incorrect if in reality the glad tidings had been ushered in with the conception and birth of the Saviour. It is here that the testimony of Peter in his public preaching expressly commences, Acts x. 37, and all the facts mentioned in his discourses relate to that period. The history of the introduction of the apostles to Jesus, indeed, sufficiently proves that they could not have personally witnessed, nor consequently have been appointed to bear their testimony to, transactions thirty years prior to this epoch, nor can they stand on the same footing in point of evidence with those to which their testimony actually applied. (See Luke xxiv. 46—48, and Acts iv. 20.) Is it in the least credible that the apostles themselves would, without any intimation, in two instances deviate from their uniform custom on other occasions, by mixing up their personal testimony, which constituted their proper office, with matters to which they were total strangers so far as it regards their experience, and without the most distant hint that they had received any such information in their intercourse with Jesus or his precursor?

If indeed the knowledge of such transactions constituted any necessary part of the qualifications of an apostle, it might as well have been communicated to Paul in that mode by which he was instructed, viz. by immediate revelation, as the particulars of the public ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus. But his testimony is as distinctly dated from the baptism of John forward, as that of Peter, Mark and John. He is so far from giving any intimations of the miraculous conception, that on several occasions he expressly declares that Jesus was "of the seed of David." It was, he declares, when John had "first preached," and "after he had fulfilled his course," that Jesus was "raised to be a Saviour."† He on two occasions derives his designation as "the Son of God," not from any miraculous conception, but

from his resurrection to a renewed existence,* and in the last instance he distinguishes between the circumstances of his introduction to this life or his fleshy lineage, in which respect he was of the seed of David, and what relates to his resurrection to a blessed immortality, by which "he was declared to be a Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness." (Rom. i. 2.) It appears, therefore, that this apostle was authorized to declare both the mode of our Lord's introduction to this life and the fact of his resurrection, and according to him it was in the latter, and not in the former respect, that he was distinguished as "the Son of God," and that "the Holy Spirit" was particularly concerned in imparting to him the blessings of existence. Whereas, had he been commissioned to make known that Christ was ushered into this world in consequence of a peculiar presence and "overshadowing of the Holy Spirit," and was on that account denominated "the Son of God," he would not have so constantly represented the case otherwise, assigning him no higher a parental origin in this respect than his descent from David. "Remember Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Tim. ii. 8.) The apostle felt the importance of maintaining this simple but most glorious doctrine in opposition to those mystic† "genealogies"

* Acts xiii. 33, and Rom. i. 4.

† See Dr. Priestley's note on 1 Tim. iv. 7. When we reflect on the glaring discordancies between the genealogies and the accounts of the miraculous conception, can we doubt that they must have been the result of "questionings," and "oppositions," and "strifes," like those to which the apostle alludes in his repeated mention of fables and genealogies? The term *profane* in the text just quoted seems to import that the fables had a Heathenish character, but in Titus i. 14, "Jewish fables" are expressly mentioned; if the same fables be meant in these two passages, it follows that they were of Jewish composition or relating to a Jewish subject, but bore a Heathenish air and character. I leave the reader to consider how far this description is applicable to the accounts of our Lord's

* Acts xiii. 23, Rom. i. 3, &c.

† Acts xiii. 24, 25.

and "old wives' fables," which were even in his time diffusing their leaven into the Christian system.

T. P.

Philadelphia,
February 13, 1826.

ALTHOUGH several pieces on this subject have appeared in your Repository, may I ask your permission to lay before your readers the state of the question as it presents itself to my mind?

As it is confessedly proper to acknowledge God in all our ways, a religious service on every interesting occasion has been usual among all denominations of Christians. At every settlement of a minister it is fit and right to implore the blessing of God on the connexion that has been formed: thus far there seems to be little, if any contrariety of opinion; but objections are urged against the appendages of an Ordination Service, more especially as it is only at the first settlement of a minister that any special public religious service is performed. It is immaterial by what name such a service is designated; it is to all intents and purposes an Ordination Service. The question therefore is, why should a service of this kind be again introduced? Here, the whole burden of proof lies on the advocates for Ordination Services. Unitarians will not be bold enough to assert that ordination is *essential* to a Christian minister; for, in that case, it is of vital importance that it be derived *from the true line of succession*; and, if so, it

birth and the circumstances attending it. To me they appear to savour strongly of the peculiar prejudices and predilections of the Jews, and yet to have a strong infusion of Heathenish ideas. The genealogies are at variance with the other particulars, if it be meant that Jesus had no human father; but if this be supposed dubious, although God is represented as interposing in an extraordinary manner on the occasion, we may perhaps account for it from that contest of motives which a Jewish Gnostic on embracing Christianity would have, under the necessity which he would feel of tracing the descent of Christ from David and his desire of ranking him among the highest of pre-existing intelligences.

must be the safest course to seek for it in the Church of Rome. As this ground is evidently untenable, the next question will be—is ordination *necessary*? In other words, are ordained ministers wiser, better, or in any respect superior to those ministers who have not been ordained? Is their ministry more useful, and do their hearers exhibit a fairer model of Christian excellence than the hearers of unordained ministers? As no evidence has been exhibited to prove that ordination has been the means of producing such beneficial results, arguments against ordination founded on the abuses to which it has given rise, may be urged with evident propriety. It is admitted, that arguments from the abuse of any measure are not valid, if it can be made to appear that such a measure is necessary; but if it is merely matter of discretion, its tendency to lead to abuse, and much more the undeniable fact that it has led to great abuses, ought to operate as a conclusive reason against its adoption. That much superstition, and that a variety of abuses have arisen from ordination, has been acknowledged and lamented by wise and good men of different sects: probably, it was a melancholy conviction of this fact which caused the discontinuance of Ordination Services among many of the English Dissenters during thirty or forty years. As it does not appear that any inconveniencies arose on that account, it is not easy to imagine why they should again be brought into fashion; and it is particularly to be deplored that such a measure should excite unpleasant feelings. If it is believed that any important benefits are derived from ordination, this is a good reason why those who think thus should avail themselves of it, and come forward as its advocates; and it would be wrong in those who hold a contrary opinion to censure them for so doing: at the same time, unless there be something like free-masonry in the matter of ordination, its moral benefits might be distinctly specified, and the reality of their existence clearly exhibited.

The utility of Ordination Services has been urged because of the valuable information communicated to the person ordained, particularly in refer-

ence to his ministerial duties ; but is not this kind of instruction part of a theological education ? Are there not abundance of publications, easily accessible, which contain it ? And would not a few months' residence with an experienced and exemplary settled minister be far preferable to the once hearing of any didactic rules, however elaborate and well-digested ? The serious study of our Lord's charge to his disciples, and of Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus, would supply a young minister with ample instruction both as to his official duties and personal behaviour, and would present to his mind the most powerful inducements to right conduct.

It has always appeared to me that some of the peculiar appendages of an Ordination Service are fitter for a private room than for a place of public resort. To give advice to an individual is a delicate matter, and therefore this should not be attempted in the bustle of a crowd, and in an hour of excitement ; but, when the parties are alone, and when the mind is calm ; and, let me add, not merely by reading what had previously been committed to paper, but by giving utterance to the genuine feelings of the heart, at the time of speaking.

After fully admitting all that has been stated as to the very unexceptionable manner in which the late Ordination Services were conducted, it may truly be alleged that this affords no security against the introduction of great abuses and of direct infringements on Christian liberty. It is in good times that inlets to corruption are made. Take the following illustration.

According to the Cambridge (Massachusetts) Platform,—“ Ordination” is “ nothing else but the solemn putting a man into his place and office in the church, whereunto he had right before by election ; being like the installing of a magistrate in the commonwealth.”—The Platform then goes on to shew, that ordination may be performed either by the elders of the church, or where there are no elders, by some of its members chosen for that purpose ; or, if the church so desire, by the elders of other churches. It is not easy to imagine how any provisions for ordination could be more explicit in regard to the preservation

of the independence of each distinct religious society. Yet, notwithstanding all this, in the Eastern States of North America, it is the usual practice among Congregationalists or Independents, for the ministers and delegates who had been invited to an ordination, to form themselves into an ordaining council, to call for a record of the proceedings relative to the intended ordination, to require from the candidate testimonials as to his character, literary attainments, &c. &c., and sometimes to interrogate him as to his religious opinions—the consequences have occasionally been, a long suspension of the public services after the appointed hour, during which the council had been engaged in warm debate ; and considerable excitement and embarrassment among all the parties more immediately connected with the intended ordination. Although it is usual to disclaim the ability to communicate any gifts or powers by the laying on of hands, yet, in the Eastern States, until this ceremonial is gone through, the person ordained can only pray and preach, he neither baptizes nor administers the Lord's Supper, and were he to perform the marriage ceremony he would be liable to a prosecution—he is also plain Mr. ; but no sooner is he ordained than he can do all these acts, he becomes reverend, and wears canonicals ; although, be it remembered, he had received no gift nor power in virtue of his ordination ! I have often, but vainly tried, to obtain a solution of this enigma. So much for the mystery of ordination, and for the tendency it has to introduce abuses.

Once more, is there not some danger lest Ordination Services should create or nourish clerical pride ? It requires more strength of mind than very young men usually possess to withstand the notion of their increased importance in consequence of having been the subjects of ordination. Something like a mystic charm is attached to the laying on of hands, and receiving the right hand of fellowship. No small number of the discourses, delivered by young ministers on this side of the Atlantic, immediately subsequent to their ordination, afford abundant proof that the *honours* of the profession are quite as much in their contemplation as its *duties*, and that

whatever lessons they had heard at their ordination, they still need to be practically taught that "before honour is humility."

Z.

Sir,
IN my last paper (pp. 146—152) I have shewn that the Nicene Creed originated in a text of Scripture which connumerates three Divine Persons, and asserts those persons to be *one*. The subscribers to that Creed interpreted this to mean one *in essence*. This is the substance of the Orthodox Creed. The Arian counter creed goes farther, and asserts *one* to mean one *in agreement*. Here we have the controverted verse of John *complete*, as it implies three persons—three persons who bear testimony—three persons who agree in testimony, that is, who bear testimony to one and the same thing. The disputed verse connumerates the three persons, the Father, the Son or the Word and the Holy Ghost, in common with the close of Matthew's Gospel, but the two clauses, Who bear testimony, and These three are one, are peculiar to the text of the Apostle John: nor is there any other verse in the whole of the New Testament to which they can be said to refer with any shadow of truth. The supposed spurious text of John is beyond contradiction the foundation of the Nicene Creed; and the meaning of it was the subject of dispute between the learned throughout the whole Christian world, about two hundred and fifty years after the death of its author, when all the earliest manuscripts, and even the autograph of the Apostle, were in the possession of those who thus disputed the sense of the text, without calling its authenticity in question. Constantine attempted to extinguish the controversy in the commencement; but having failed, he convoked a council at Nice to form a creed which, by being universally subscribed, might create peace, and put an end to dispute in all the churches. In pursuance of the same design, he caused copies of the New Testament to be provided for the public use. This commission, we learn from Theodoret, was entrusted to Eusebius: and as the emperor appears from his own words to have considered the verse as

dangerous, and the cause of the disturbances, which he was most anxious to suppress, no doubt can be entertained but that it was suppressed in all those copies. Had we no more evidence for the text, the authenticity of it must appear established for ever. But the sheet-anchor of that authenticity yet remains to be noticed.

About the latter end of the fourth century, Jerome was engaged by Pope Damasus to revise the Septuagint and the Christian Scriptures. For this arduous work he was eminently qualified by talents and skill in the Hebrew and Greek languages. In spite of every impediment thrown in his way, he persevered in the glorious task, his illustrious patron having died before its completion. Nearly thirty years had elapsed before he reached the seven canonical epistles. To his revision of these he prefixed a prologue, of which the following is a faithful translation: "The order of the seven Epistles (meaning the Epistles of Peter, James, John and Jude) in those Greek copyists who think soundly and follow the right faith, is not the same as it is found in the Latin copies. *As Peter is first*, so his Epistles are placed in the former before the rest. But as I have long since corrected the evangelists according to the rule of truth, so these epistles I have restored to their proper order, which, if arranged agreeably to the original text and faithfully interpreted in Latin diction, would neither cause perplexity to the readers nor would the various readings contradict themselves, especially in that place where we read of the unity of the Trinity laid down in the Epistle of John. In this I found translators (or copyists) widely deviating from the truth, who set down in their own editions the names only of the three witnesses, that is, the Water, Blood and Spirit, but omit the testimony of the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, by which above all places the divinity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is proved to be one. *How far my edition differs from those of others I leave to the discernment of the reader. But whilst thou, O Virgin of Christ, demandest of me the truth of Scripture, thou in a manner exposest my old age to the rancorous teeth of those mali-*

cious men who hold me forth as faithless and a perverter of the Sacred Writings. But in such an undertaking I neither dread the malice of rivals, nor shall I withhold the truth of the Holy Scriptures from those who demand it."

The adversaries of the verse were aware that, if this preface were allowed to be genuine, they could not well dispute the genuineness of John's text. They therefore suppose it to be spurious, the production of a later age, though it carries in itself unequivocal marks of authenticity beyond any document to be found in ancient records. It is brief indeed and summary, but it is full of solid matter, which, like the aged oak, the monarch of the forest, strikes its roots deep and strong into the circumstances of Jerome's life. The attacks of Griesbach and Porson have, it is true, stripped it of its reputation; but it still stands and will for ever stand: and its branches, though now shattered and rendered bare by their unhallowed blasts, will again recover their integrity and firmness, and descend to future ages, covered with the imperishable verdure of truth.

Griesbach, in his diatribe, quoted the prologue, but has omitted the words I have put in italics, though they supply some important facts which place the authenticity of the piece beyond all reasonable doubt. This omission is a stain upon his memory, as it shews that he was either careless or ignorant, or capable of dealing unfairly with his readers. The Greek Professor has not cited the original prologue, but favours us only with the following flourishing comment upon it: "At the request or command of Damasus, Jerome revised the Latin translation, and corrected it upon the faith of the Greek manuscripts. Did he, therefore, replace the three Heavenly Witnesses at this revision or not? If he did, why did he not then write his preface to inform the world of his recovered reading? But after Damasus was dead, Eustochium, it seems, a young lady at once devout, handsome and learned, requests him once more to revise the Catholic epistles and correct them from the Greek. Jerome undertakes the task; and having completed it, advertises her in this pro-

logue, that other inaccurate translators had omitted the testimony of the three Heavenly Witnesses, the strongest proof of the Catholic faith. Such a story carries its own condemnation upon its forehead." P. 289. In reply to this I beg the readers of the Repository to weigh well the following facts.

1. Here Mr. Porson was betrayed into a gross error by a state of mind which evidently disqualified him to come at the truth. He takes it for granted that Jerome had finished his task *before* the death of his patron, and that the restoration of the three Heavenly Witnesses was the consequence of another revision required by Eustochium; whereas Damasus had been dead some years before the critic took in hand the Catholic Epistles. The story therefore, instead of carrying its own condemnation upon its forehead, carries in it the assurance of its genuineness, because it arises from circumstances peculiar to the author which the Professor had not the sagacity to discover. The piece being addressed to Eustochium, I grant, gives it, at first view, the appearance of fiction. But when it is considered, that this "Virgin of Christ" was a lady of rank as well as of piety and learning; that she is mentioned by Jerome in scores of places; that the history of her life is interwoven with his writings; that it is even to her he addresses his Treatise De Virginitate, the appearance of fiction, which a forger would be careful to avoid, must give way to the reality of truth, which usually forces itself, unsought, on the attention of every genuine writer, though it might occasion some suspicion of forgery in a reader unacquainted with all the circumstances of the case.

2. The indefatigable zeal of Jerome in the noblest and the most useful of all causes, namely, the comparing the best original MSS., and correcting by them the various versions of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, brought down upon him the envy and opposition of his rivals. Rufinus asks him, "Who of all the great and wise men that preceded thee, dared to put his hand to this undertaking? Wilt thou presume to change the books of the Holy Scriptures which the Apostles delivered to the churches of Christ

as the fullest standard of faith, by interpolating them with new interpretations borrowed from the Jews?" To this he answers, that by his interpretation he never intended to supersede or censure the Seventy translators: *Audiant canes mei*, says he, *idcirco me in hoc volumine laborasse, non ut interpretationem antiquam reprehenderem, &c.* In another place he says, *Periculosum opus certe et obtrectatorum meorum latratibus patens, qui me asserunt in LXX. interpretum suggillationem nova pro veteribus cudere. Quid igitur, damnamus veteres? Minime, sed post priorum studia, quod possumus in domo Domini laboramus.* Augustine was Jerome's intimate friend, yet he strongly disapproved of his labours, and as it appears from letters X. and XIX. addressed to Jerome himself, he forbade Jerome's version to be used in his diocese.

Now, reader, compare with these facts the following declaration made in the prologue to Eustochium: "But whilst thou, O Virgin of Christ, demandest of me the truth of Scripture, thou in a manner exposest my old age to the rancorous teeth of those malicious men, who hold me forth as a falsifier and corrupter of the Holy Scriptures." Observe farther, in this place, an important information that is accidentally dropped, namely, the period of life when Jerome restored the disputed verse and revised the Canonical Epistles. It was when he had sense and magnanimity to defy clamour, as fast sinking under the weight of years to that rest, where the sting of envy is no longer felt, and the voice of slander is silent for ever. Let me here add, that the author was, from the beginning, aware of the calumnies that awaited him, when he should restore the text of the three Heavenly Witnesses; and he thus as it were anticipates what he should be called upon to say in his prologue to the Canonical Epistles. *Cogor per singulos Scripturæ Divinæ libros adversariorum respondere maledictis. Preface to Job.*

3. With regard to the prologue itself, a variety of circumstances beyond the reach of forgery in a future age, and peculiar to the situation of the author, concur in establishing its genuineness. Damasus engaged him

to revise the Latin Version, and the author of the prologue alludes to his revision as in part accomplished. *Sicut Evangelistas dudum ad veritatis lineam correximus; ita has proprio ordini, Deo nos juvante, reddidimus.* He tells his fair patroness, that at all hazard he would restore the genuine text; and we find it actually restored in the very translation which came from his hands. The prologue is ascribed, and we find it come down to posterity among Jerome's works, though some copies are allowed to be without it. Walafrid Strabo commented upon it, in the ninth century, as the production of Jerome; and neither he nor any other of that age appears to have had any suspicion of its being a forgery. But hear Mr. Porson: "If this prologue had been universally acknowledged for Jerome's, how could Bede overlook it? Bede's *silence*, both with respect to the disputed verse and the prologue, is a *complete proof* that he knew nothing of the prologue, and a probable argument that it was not even extant in his life. The only appeals to it are made by Walafrid Strabo in the ninth, and the Sorbonne Correctorium in the tenth century." P. 296. The reader will smile to see Bede's silence respecting the disputed verse cited as a complete proof that he knew nothing of the prologue. This argument is not worthy of the Greek Professor, but quite worthy of his cause.

4. The Professor, page 297, adds, "But if there were no other objection to this prologue, the style alone would determine it not to be Jerome's. Whatever be his subject his language is always spirited and perspicuous, while the prologue is written in a barbarous and uncouth jargon. Let us consider the reasoning and connexion: '*as we formerly corrected the Evangelists to the line of truth, so we have, by God's assistance, restored these (Epistles) to their proper order.*' The real Jerome would never have indulged himself in so silly a parallel, when he might have said, and ought to have said, *ita et has, Deo juvante, Græcæ fidei reddidimus.* This would have been a proper subject for his joy and piety, instead of childishly commending himself for such a trifle as restoring the order of

the Epistles." Mr. Porson is not the first who, overlooking the circumstances of his author, thus blames him for the want of sense or propriety. Jerome was surrounded with vigilant and jealous rivals; and it was of importance to him to render prominent every advantage which he could give to his Version. Besides, he was now the advocate of the Pope's pre-eminence over the authority of the Greek Church; and it was a stroke of policy to dwell on the superiority of St. Peter, of whom the Roman Pontiff claimed to be the representative. Mr. Porson, it seems, was a stranger to these things; and it would have been well for his reputation, if he had not attempted to speak of them. As to the style, the correction of the Professor is scarcely worthy of a school-boy. There are in this prologue, the same spirit, the same zeal and intrepidity; and, finally, the same energy, point and pregnant brevity, which characterize his Epistles and other Prefaces. Jerome opposes himself to other translators, who had reversed the original order. To mark this opposition the pronoun *nos* was necessary; this the Professor excludes, in his amended style, which shews that his head was so filled with forgery and interpolation, that he could not enter into the situation of the real writer.

5. The Professor proceeds: "It is also observable, that though the main drift was to give currency to his favourite verse of the three Heavenly Witnesses, he is afraid to affirm directly that it was in the Greek MSS., and only insinuates that falsehood in cautious and perplexed language. . . . He does not positively affirm that he has restored the verse upon the authority of Greek MSS., but in order to possess the reader with that belief, envelopes his meaning in a cloud of words. This objection will not seem of little weight to those who know that many persons will insinuate a falsehood, which they dare not assert in explicit terms." Pp. 298, 299. Now, so far from there being any truth in this reasoning, the very manner in which the author of the prologue cites the authority of the Greek copies, places it, to my view, beyond the reach of forgery. Before Jerome commenced his great work, he held it out in explicit terms, that he was to

correct the Seventy interpreters by the original Hebrew, and the Latin Version of the New Testament by the Greek MSS. This was universally known to be his object; and hence, in his book concerning the Ecclesiastical Writers, he says, *V. Testamentum juxta Hebræicum transtuli, Novum Græcæ fidei reddidi*. Now, let us look to his preface, addressed to Damasus in the beginning of the Gospels, as well as to the prologue before us, and what are we to expect? An explicit declaration that he proceeded on the authority of Greek MSS., or an *implication* that he did so, without directly asserting it? Undoubtedly the latter: and a comparison of the two will shew that the address to Damasus and the prologue stand precisely on the same ground, and claim alike Jerome for their common author. On the other hand, if an interpolator inserted the text in Jerome's Version at some succeeding period, he would not have been content merely to insinuate it, but must have directly asserted that he restored the verse on the faith of the Greek copies. Otherwise he would have had the audacity to commit a forgery without alleging, as common sense required, some direct show of authority to impose it as genuine on the world.

6. "But if Jerome had told us that his Greek MSS. contained the three Heavenly Witnesses, he would have told a notorious falsehood." P. 301. This is coming to the question: and to this bold assertion I shall be content to oppose one fact which has been already developed. We have reason to believe that in the Council at Nice were assembled not fewer than *two thousand and forty-eight* bishops. These discussed the meaning of the text without calling its authenticity in question. The distance of this period from the death of John did not exceed 250 years; and if not the autograph of that Apostle, Greek MSS. contemporary with all the Apostles, and certified with some or with all their signatures, must have been in the possession of the persons who subscribed the Nicene Creed. All these MSS., a century afterwards, passed through the hands of Jerome, who perfectly knew the history and fate of the verse, which Griesbach and Porson did not.

7. This brings me to another fact. The text, as Bengelius asserts, was excluded from the Greek and Latin copies in public use, so early as the second century. About the beginning of the fourth, the peace of the churches was interrupted by the violent disputes which it occasioned. In order to allay these disputes, Constantine first caused the formation of the Nicene Creed, and then the providing a sufficient number of copies in the churches without the controverted text. These facts stand on their own evidence: and what is remarkable, the providence of God, which has ever guarded the interests of truth, causes Jerome, as it were, to rise from the dead, and through the medium of his prologue, to attest the same facts in nearly express terms: "In this I found translators (or copyists) widely deviating from the truth; who set down in their own editions (or copies) the names only of the three witnesses, that is, the water, blood and spirit, *but omit the testimony of the Father, the Son and Holy Spirit.*" I appeal to common sense, whether the author of the prologue would have made a declaration of this kind, if it had not been a fact forced on his attention by a knowledge and conviction of the truth. If he were a forger he would *not* have made it, though he had known it to be true; because it tended to bring into discredit a verse, which he had restored as unquestionable words of the Apostle John.

8. Here, in the eighth place, I am led to observe that the verse, as restored by Jerome, carries in itself the strongest possible presumption of its authenticity. The author restores it with the express design of proving the Trinity. To do this with truth, it was necessary in connumerating the three divine witnesses to substitute *the Son*, for *the Word*, the former being a real person, the latter the attributes of God personified, though occasionally applied to Christ in his official capacity. This substitution has been adopted by all the Greek and Roman fathers, from Irenæus down to Jerome. This was in opposition to the Unitarians or Sabellians, who adhered to the true reading of *the Word*. It is remarkable, that even Arius uses the same language in his disputes with Alexander: for

he says not *ἐκ αἰῶν ἦν ὁ τῷ Θεῷ υἱός*, but *ὁ τῷ Θεῷ λόγος*, and this he repeats in several ways, connumerating the Logos with the Father, instead of the Son. The author of the prologue must have felt the weight and tendency of the true connumeration; and, beyond all doubt, he would have followed the example of his predecessors in avoiding it, if that prologue or the verse itself had been an interpolation; and nothing but the force of truth could have prevented this, as Jerome, when left to his own choice, immediately gives a different connumeration. He had, however, the *dishonesty* to make the last clause of the eighth verse, which destroys the orthodox interpretation of the seventh, the same in both, thus seeking to silence the Arians who insisted on *unity of agreement*, as the unity meant by the Apostle. The assertion of Thomas Aquinas that "these three agree in one," was a forgery of the Arians, illustrates at once this artifice of Jerome, and, at the same time, affords a sure pledge that he would, in imitation of his predecessors, have changed the true connumeration, had he felt it a difficulty pressing with equal weight against the orthodox faith.

9. But it may be asked, If the advocates of the Trinity, from the second to the fifth century, excluded the verse as dangerous to it, how came Jerome, who advocated the same doctrine, to take a quite opposite course, and restore it under a sense of the same danger? By doing this, instead of strengthening the orthodox faith, he was running a risk of blowing up at once the whole system; and, at the same time, of exasperating all his contemporaries by acting in defiance of them, and the authorities who went before them. The true answer to this pertinent question is to be found in the political history of Jerome's age and of his pursuits as a biblical critic. At the close of the fourth century Theodosius ascended the throne. He was a *consubstantialist* and a bitter enemy of the Arians. These he exterminated, and their books he caused every where to be burnt. By these means all danger from the heretics was removed, and the Catholics found themselves at liberty without molestation, to strengthen the fortress of orthodoxy by any measure

which they might think proper to adopt. Jerome availed himself of this more auspicious time, to restore the verse; though, had he lived at an earlier period, he would doubtless have concurred in the course pursued by his orthodox brethren. Besides this, personal resentment had a considerable share in his determination. His engagements and his high talents, though most honourably and usefully directed, brought upon him the envy and opposition of his contemporaries. This ungenerous conduct alienated and determined him to act in defiance of them, saying, as he does say, in the prologue, "I neither dread the malice of rivals, nor shall I withhold the truth of the Holy Scriptures from those who ask it." In all this the hand of God is most visible; as without these causes, the restoration of the text, and with it the restoration of genuine Christianity, would have been precluded.

10. When I take a general view of the prologue before me, I cannot help looking upon Griesbach, Porson, Marsh and the Quarterly Reviewer, to whatever eminence they have risen by native talents and acquirements above the rest of mankind, as having left common sense and common sagacity behind them, when they insist on its spuriousness. The buoyance of vigorous powers enabled them to emerge from the dregs of prejudices, in which they conceived others to be wallowing; and, reaching the summit of learning, they glide with its stream, luxuriating in its muddy froth as delicious amber, while the truth lies far below them, sparkling like golden sand at the bottom.

Jerome, in his Preface to the book of Job, complains that the malice of his adversaries compelled him to suspend his work, and answer them by prefaces occasionally prefixed to the sacred books: and is it credible that, when he arrived at the seven Canonical Epistles, and saw the shock which he was likely to give to the public feeling and the public opinion, he should leave the important alterations he had occasion to introduce without noticing, in a preface, the necessity for them and the authorities upon which he proceeded? Is it likely that Griesbach should have omitted the

verse in his edition of the New Testament, without a *diatribe* to justify the omission? Or is it to be supposed that Mr. Belsham should have excluded it from the Improved Version, without a note to state his conviction of its forgery? Jerome, with regard to his contemporaries, stood in a predicament far more critical than these gentlemen: and his prologue, brief and pithy as it is, stands as vitally connected with the transactions in which he was personally engaged, as his head with his own body: and what should we say of learned men, if they argued in the following manner: "Jerome, to be sure, lived in the fifth century, but had no head, this being clapped by a certain moulder of clay on his shoulder, two or three hundred years after he was buried"? Men that argued after this manner would be deemed little better than a parcel of Bedlamites, splendidly endowed, indeed, by Providence, but let loose to play their anticks in the face of society, for no other end than to render talents ridiculous, and to expose the folly of learning, when fettered in preconceived opinions, or blinded with a lofty confidence in one's self.

The prologue suggests that the disputed text was excluded from some copies, and improperly arranged in others that had it. *Quæ si ut ab eis (i. e. ab eis Græcis) digestæ sunt—illo præcipue loco ubi de Unitate Trinitatis in prima Johannis epistola positum legimus.* It intimates, farther, that those who excluded the text of the three heavenly witnesses, endeavoured to deduce the Unity of the Trinity from the three names—the water, blood and spirit: and this in fact, has been done from the days of Jerome, and afterwards by annexing to them a mystical sense expressive of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. On this allegory Mr. Porson observes, p. 311, "That no writer in his perfect mind could possibly adopt this allegorical interpretation of the eighth verse, if the seventh were extant in his copy: because it is not likely that any body, seeing the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed in the seventh verse, should extract it from the eighth by an unnatural construction." P. 307. By means of this argument the Professor infers the absence of the

verse from the copies used by Cyprian, Eucherius, Augustine and others, referring their supposed citation of the seventh to a mystical gloss of the eighth.

This is the chief instrument by which the genuineness of the verse was annihilated in the judgment of the learned; and its fallacy will appear from the three following remarks: First, the reference proceeds on the assumption that the seventh verse proves the doctrine of the Trinity, while, if properly interpreted, it proves the simple humanity of Christ. Secondly, the allegory of the eighth verse is so unnatural, absurd, and even impious, (for it makes water to mean God the Father,) that it never would have been thought of, if it had not been suggested by the presence of the seventh, and adopted by cunning interpreters as an expedient to give a wrong direction to their readers, and by that means prevent the true meaning of the seventh from being known. In order to secure this text from danger, and to pervert it, in safety, to the support of the Trinity, it was necessary for these true sons of the Church to leave the plain and solid ground of common sense, and rise into the region of mysticism; and they let off this allegory as a smaller balloon to pilot their readers in their interpretation of the seventh verse. Thirdly, the allegory was suggested by a transposition of the two verses, and then, and not till then, adopted. Hear the Professor's own words: "Bengelius wishes to transpose the seventh and eight verses. I believe that this was the position of the verses when the Heavenly Witnesses first obtained admittance. The allegorical interpretation will then so naturally follow the verse which it explains, particularly in the copies which announce the Heavenly Witnesses with a *sicut*, that the manner in which the interpretation was made, will be obvious to any person acquainted with the history of MSS. Twells saw something of this consequence; for he reasons against the idea of an allegory or marginal gloss upon this ground—that the oldest and best MSS. prefix the seventh verse; but, says he, if the seventh verse were a gloss engendered by the eighth, the seventh would follow the

eighth. The plain answer to this reasoning is, that such, indeed, was the arrangement of the two verses." P. 394.

Finally, the prologue intimates that even in the days of Jerome there were various readings of the verse, which contradicted each other, and caused doubt and uncertainty to the readers. "If all these various readings," says Mr. Porson, "were presented in one view to any person, endowed with common sense, moderately instructed in the principles of criticism, and uninfluenced in the present debate by interest or passion, he could not help concluding that the number and importance of the various readings furnish reasonable ground for a suspicion of corruption. That a passage which so often adds, omits or alters particular words, which now precedes, now follows, the unsuspected part of the text; which is sometimes seen in the body of the work, sometimes in the margin, sometimes by the same, sometimes by a different hand, sometimes after a rasure, which, in short, changes shapes faster than Proteus or Empusa; that such a passage is exceedingly questionable, whatever shape it assumes," &c. P. 142.

How differently does the same thing strike different minds! I am not influenced by interest or passion in the present debate; and am too, it is hoped, moderately instructed in the principles of criticism, yet to my mind various readings, the variety of forms and positions which the verse assumed, its transposition with the eighth, open fresh evidence of its genuineness. Uniformity may often be the effect of art and systematic falsehood, while diversity changes with a change of circumstances; agreement in the main and variance in inferior parts, are characteristics of nature and of truth. I should, therefore, thus reason on the present occasion. The verse is certainly authentic: the tattered form in which it appears, the patches put upon it, and the turning of it, as it were, inside out, prove only that it is *old*, and has long suffered violence and hard service, not that it never came from the hand of the Apostle. Its dismemberment and abuse must therefore be referred to some causes very different from interpolation. The pre-

rise words used by the Apostle, and the arrangement which he gave to the context, were repugnant to the views of those who, coming after him, quoted or copied the verse; and they sought to alter its sense by altering its position or true reading. If it had been a forgery the authors of it would have at once placed it where it would have answered their purpose best: and it is certain that they and their coadjutors, in successive ages, would exert all their endeavours to prevent its mutilation and variety of shape to appear in evidence against its authenticity. If, in a solitary spot, I saw the decayed and scattered bones of a human being, I should instantly conclude that a person once existed to whom they belonged. Mr. Porson, if he were consistent, would insist on the contrary conclusion. He would say, These bones are mangled and scattered by violence, and therefore never formed a real body. The inference he draws, resembles that which Jacob drew when he saw the mantle of his son torn to pieces and stained with blood. The inference, however, in both cases, proves erroneous. The verse, like Joseph, was still alive. Pious fraud forced it away, and, with the gospel in its original simplicity, sold it to Antichrist; and thus for ages they were held in worse than Egyptian bondage. But the period of their common deliverance is at hand. The diffusion of knowledge, the progress of inquiry, the spirit of rational and manly freedom, will sooner or later melt their chains; and the powers of darkness, like Pharaoh and his hosts, shall be scattered on the waves.

BEN DAVID.

SIR,
THE pages of the Repository have sometimes suggested the expediency of some new name being adopted by the general body of Unitarians, and it appears probable that some advantages might be attained by such a measure. It is not that the name of Unitarians is not well fitted to characterize the leading opinion of those to whom it is applied, whether they are of those that retain the doctrine of Christ's personal pre-existence, or of those who believe in his strict and proper humanity: the former falling under the denomination of Arians,

the latter having no better distinguishing appellation than Nazareans, as Lardner calls them, and being also frequently called Socinians. I say no new terms are needed to distinguish the doctrines which these parties severally hold, nor to distinguish the parties themselves, when we wish to speak of them simply with reference to those doctrines. But as a body of Christians, associating together for the purposes of religious worship and edification, it may be questioned whether it be expedient that their popular and current name should be derived from their peculiar opinions at all. In the first place, we may observe, that doctrinal peculiarities are not the source from which most other religious sects have derived their names; these have been borrowed from some obvious peculiarity in their church discipline or ceremonies, or from some insignificant accidental circumstance. It is enough to name the Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Methodists, Quakers and Moravians. None of these names convey any intimation of the views to which these several parties incline on the principal controversial topics of theology. Yet we well know that each of these sects does in fact maintain its own proper system of divinity with sufficient distinctness and rigour, and as effectually, I dare to say, as if the whole of their creed were embodied in their title. Hence it is clear that it is not a matter of necessity, at any rate, to adopt expressive doctrinal appellations in order to preserve in religious societies the opinions which are thought most correct: there must be other circumstances in the constitution of religious bodies by which this end is sufficiently secured. And if it is not necessary, the following considerations may lead us to doubt whether it be expedient. In the first place, where, as in the case of Unitarians, the name by which a religious society chooses to designate itself is one that implies a generally offensive doctrine, in such a case prejudice is unnecessarily excited. It is an old remark, that mankind are more influenced by names than by realities. And it is important to consider, that a large part of society, misled by the calumnious misrepresentations with which the disingenuous champions of

the prevailing faith are for ever loading our sect, attach to the term *Unitarian* ideas very different from those which we design it to convey, so that those who adopt it scarcely know to what a heap of injurious misconceptions they thereby subject themselves. There are, indeed, some zealous advocates who are fond of ringing this party appellation for ever in one's ears, and not long ago, in a chapel in the metropolis, I was greatly annoyed in being obliged to sit out a sermon in which it was introduced at least twenty times. Such seem to forget that correct notions of doctrine are at best but a small part of religion, and while they are for ever harping on what reminds one of disunion and strife, they make one long to hear more of that kingdom which is righteousness and peace and holy spiritual joy. But we may surely hold fast our own convictions honestly and openly without, as it were, writing them on our foreheads. These distinctive names are shibboleths of discord; and though we disavow the use of creeds and subscriptions, yet our societies' calling themselves by a name involving a controverted point of doctrine has a good deal of the same effect. It prejudices an important question, and commits the ministers and members where they ought to be most freely open to the influence of the evidence of truth. It savours too much of a contentious and speculative turn when the terms of controversy are made to stand so prominent.

It would be better, I humbly conceive, to dig deeper for a foundation. There are broader and less obnoxious principles which lie at the root of rational and liberal divinity, and from which the conclusions which Unitarians arrive at in regard to particular dogmas naturally spring. Such are the duty of free inquiry; the propriety of rational interpretation; the expediency of holding fast what is clear, obscurer passages notwithstanding; and that all-important general conviction that the essence of religion consists not in orthodox doctrine or devotional observances, or any occult experiences, but in rational piety towards God, displayed in love and goodwill to man. These are the great and truly valuable principles which I may

fairly say distinguish the Unitarian sect: their views of the Divine nature and of the person of Christ are consequences naturally arising out of the mental habits with which these principles are associated. Whatever is rational, equitable and benevolent, is that which is congenial to this turn of mind, and therefore in a mind so disposed, I think it no wonder that the Unitarian scheme of divinity dislodges the Calvinistic. Would it not be better to assert the premises than to anticipate the conclusion?

In order then to provide an appellation expressive, in some good measure, of the turn and genius of Unitarian Christianity, and yet at the same time such as will not give occasion to needless and unseasonable offence, I shall take the liberty of submitting the term *Philadelphian* to the consideration of your readers, whom I hardly need remind that its original, *φιλὰδελφία*, is of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and signifies brotherly love. The sense therefore as well as the sound of this word is sufficiently conciliating, and would serve as a continual remembrancer to our societies of what they pre-eminently ought to be, while it indicated to other Christians what it is in religion which they think most essential. Should it be objected, that this name does not convey the essential peculiarities of Unitarian doctrine, I repeat, that I am aware of that, and think it an advantage, and have already adduced the arguments for that opinion. In the same way the Wesleyan Methodists, although Arminians in doctrine, prefer not so controversial a title for common use.

Should it seem good to any of our brethren to bring into use this appellation of *Philadelphian* in reference to their societies and chapels, I am inclined to think that it would be like removing a certain abrupt and conspicuous barrier by which a tract of forbidden ground is bounded. The use of our present appellation seems to involve all who frequent our chapels in an explicit avowal of Unitarian doctrine. Many are not prepared exactly for this, who yet at the same time are best pleased when they hear nothing of the contrary doctrine. On these difficult points their views are not sufficiently clear, and they are

more disposed to waive the question, and hear little about it, than to come forward with a decided declaration of disbelief in doctrines held so sacred. Such persons ought not to be deterred by an unnecessary stumbling-block from frequenting that worship which in reality they most approve. It is but common prudence to give them opportunity of deserting quietly from the enemy's ranks without obliging them formally to renounce their allegiance. The essential and professed principle of *Philadelphianism* would be this, *that the essence of religion lies in brotherly love, and that the doubtful and disputed doctrines are not to be insisted on, as being comparatively of little consequence.* This is in appearance broad and neutral ground, but such is the nature of the case, that we may safely affirm that this maxim is nearly equivalent to Unitarianism. The doubtful and disputed doctrines are essential parts of all other systems, and he that represents brotherly love as the essence of religion, is tacitly superseding the stupendous mysteries of the orthodox faith, for his system renders them unnecessary. With the Apostle, then, I say, Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενετω.

ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ.

SIR,
PERMIT me to direct the attention of the numerous readers of your Repository, and that of your correspondent, the Rev. Noah Jones, in particular, (whose communication in a late number, p. 72, has excited mingled feelings of surprise and concern in the minds of the majority of Unitarian Christians,) to some extracts from the writings of the late eminently learned, and no less eminently pious and benevolent Moses Mendelssohn; who, although a Jew, seems to have been deeply imbued with that spirit of charity, which, if not the distinguishing characteristic, is at least one of the most beautiful and attractive features of the Christian religion. Happy will it be for the world, when men shall cease to judge each other for speculative points of belief, which must be as various as the human mind—when they shall rejoice to unite with their fellow-men in the expression of those devotional feelings which are common to all creeds—and when the inferior spirits

of the age shall be content humbly to imitate the example of a Newton, a Locke, a Mendelssohn, who could admire virtue even in an Unbeliever, and believe that the prayers of every sincere petitioner, if accompanied by rectitude of conduct and active philanthropy, will, as in the case of the yet unenlightened Cornelius, "come up for a memorial before God," on whatever revelation he may rest his hopes, or even should he be led to study the attributes, and learn the eternal mercy of the Deity, from "the book of nature fair" alone. The following passages are extracted from the Preface to a translation into German of *Manasseh Ben Israel's Apology for the Jews*, by Mendelssohn; in which he comments on a work by *Counsellor Von Dohm*, "*On the Condition of the Jews as Citizens of the State.*"

"What sensible person would pretend to reform his neighbour's thoughts, or to chasten his heart by coercion? If we meet, in society, with a man of a froward heart, with wild and improper notions on the fundamental points of religion, we have no other power but to reason with him in a mild and conciliating manner, and try to persuade him, by patient argument, to dismiss his erroneous opinions and return to wholesome doctrine; in which we may persevere until we are certain that the delusion has left him. If we find him incorrigible, it will be better to discontinue our efforts, lest we should convert a sceptic, who had, at least, the merit of sincerity, into a hypocrite and a liar. Would it not be preferable to rouse his conscience and mortify his presumption, by shewing him the humbleness of his condition, in regard to the Deity whom he disparages, than to stun him with abuse, heap shame and ignominy on his character, and, perhaps, prove his ruin? It is a widely different case when such a man is offensively licentious or blasphemous in public, when he sets a bad example to the community he belongs to, by proceedings subversive of morality, decency and social order; then he steps out of *this* class, enters the *first*, and his conduct becomes cognizable by the magistrate, who, if he find him guilty, is to punish him for what he *has been doing*, but not for what he *has been thinking.*"

"How much less right, then, have

we to be indignant and vindictive on account of things which, with our frail reason, we presume a man *capable of doing!* After the most sedulous search, in the whole range of philosophical and ethical learning, I have not been able to find a single passage to justify sovereigns and governments in persecuting Sectarians or Dissenters from the established religion. *If these Dissenters are occasionally in the wrong, they are not wilfully so. The Creator implanted in them, as in all men, a longing after knowledge and perfection: they suppose themselves to be in the path of truth; if they swerve from it in the integrity of their hearts, is that a sufficient reason for hatred and persecution?*"

"Beware then, brethren, of judging uncharitably of your neighbours; desist from dealing out anathema and excommunication on him who falls inadvertently. Rather draw him unto you with mild words and gentle persuasion. Forbid him not your meetings; let not the doors of your assemblies and places of worship be shut to him when he comes to pour out his heart before his Maker. If ye do, if ye cast him off, and consider him as a stranger, ye cut off the return to repentance; the guilt is yours, he is doubly innocent. *The house of God should be accessible to all: it is properly the abode of universal love, and peace should encompass it; let then every mortal enter it, and adore the Supreme Being as his individual feelings guide him. And ye, esteemed Christians, eminent for wisdom and learning, if it be your wish to promote peace and brotherly love amongst mankind, do not countenance with the force of your intellect the sway of one man over the religious opinions of another. God alone searches the heart, and knows our secret thoughts. We are but of yesterday, and know nothing. Leave supremacy to God, and love each other like brethren.*"

Dublin,

Oct. 10, 1825.

SIR,

I HAVE long been of opinion that a Church might be formed which would embrace all the necessary Christian doctrines without giving offence to any well-minded Christian: of this I am fully persuaded, that there is enough on which all Christians are agreed to join in social worship. My

wish is rather to form a truly Christian Church than to adopt the peculiar opinions of any sect.

When I was lately in London, I found some, whom I thought firmly attached to the Established Church, had found their way into the Chapel in York Street, St. James's, and who were pleased with the service and the facility with which they were accommodated. If their form of service, or somewhat similar, was adopted, (for I am not anxious for adherence to any particular form or any set words or expressions,) so as that nothing revolting to the feelings or sentiments of any conscientious Christian be introduced—I think a truly Catholic Church may be constituted to unite all Christians in holy communion, as the memorable John Hales says in a Tract on Schism, published in 1667: "Were liturgies and public forms of service so framed, as that they admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained such things as in which all Christians do agree, Schisms on opinion were utterly vanished. For, consider of all the Liturgies that are, or ever have been, and remove from them whatsoever is scandalous to any party, and leave but what all agree on, and the event shall be, that the public service and honour of God shall no ways suffer; whereas, to load our public forms with the private fancies upon which we differ, is the most sovereign way to perpetuate Schism to the world's end."

If in the formation of such a Church we were to take a hint from Rammohun Roy and confine ourselves to the Precepts of Jesus, why should not such a Church become universal? If any friends of the gospel of peace would open such a place of worship and fully announce to the public their liberal views, I can have little doubt but the Church would increase and multiply with the increasing liberality and extended knowledge of the age. I repeat that my object is not to add to the number of any sect, but that the true and genuine spirit of Christianity should extend over the habitable globe. While scientific and general knowledge is rapidly diffusing to the uttermost parts of the earth, why should Christian knowledge be suffered to be comparatively at a stand? The signs of the times

lead us to expect that great events and revolutions are soon likely to take place; all well-disposed Christians should then be on the watch to take advantage of any change that can benefit the good cause, and I am confident that many readers of the *Monthly Repository* would lend a willing hand to further so desirable an object as the establishment of an Universal Church.

J. H.

SIR, April, 18, 1826.

IF you consider the following anecdote worthy a corner in the *Repository*, its insertion will oblige, J. F.

MAHOMET II., Emperor of the Turks, having seen some of the performances of Bellini, the Venetian painter, was so struck with them, that he wrote to the Republic, entreating them to send him. The painter accordingly went to Constantinople, where he did many excellent pieces. Among the rest, he painted the decollation of St. John the Baptist, whom the Turks revere as a great prophet. Mahomet admired the proportion and shadowing of the work; but he remarked one defect in regard to the skin of the neck, from which the head was separated; and in order to prove the truth of his observation, he sent for a slave, and ordered his head to be struck off. This sight so shocked the painter, that he could not be easy till he had obtained his dismissal; which the Grand Signior granted, and made him a present of a gold chain.

Correspondence between the Bishop of Norwich and a Methodist Preacher.

Mr. Thomas Rowe, Methodist Preacher, to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Norwich.

Lynn,

MY LORD, Nov. 1825.

I TRUST your Lordship will pardon the application of a stranger, on a subject of a very powerful interest to the parties concerned; and as the case has occurred within the diocese of Norwich, I hope this application will not be considered intrusive or irregular. An infant child, in the parish of Middleton, near Lynn, who was baptized by the Rev. Mr. Rowland, a Wesleyan minister, died on

Tuesday the 8th of this month. The minister of the parish, the very Rev. Dean Wood, has refused burial on the ground of the infant being unbaptized. A copy of the register of the child's baptism, and also of Sir John Nicholl's judgment on a similar case, have been delivered into the hands of the minister, and yet the very Rev. Dean persists in refusing burial to the child. If it were a doubtful case, or if there were any convenient ground in which the remains of the unoffending infant could be deposited, the parents would not have troubled your Lordship on the occasion; but as the body is turning to a mass of putrefaction before the eyes of its surviving relations, and they have no where to bury the dead out of their sight, they earnestly entreat your Lordship's interference. I remain, my Lord, &c.

THOMAS ROWE.

The Bishop's Answer.

SIR,

"Days (says Job) should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom." How far Dean Wood may accede to the truth of this remark, as applicable to me, I dare not venture peremptorily to decide. But I am inclined to believe, from the intercourse which has passed between us upon former occasions, he will not be indisposed to pay some deference to the opinion of a brother clergyman who is now in the 82d year of his age; and I have no hesitation in stating most unequivocally what that opinion is. The decision of so well-informed a civilian as Sir John Nicholl, justifies, I think, any minister of the Established Church in pursuing that line of conduct towards Dissenters of all denominations which candour, and meekness, and moderation, and Christian charity, must make him anxious to pursue on all occasions, especially upon so interesting a one as that mentioned in your letter, and in behalf of an individual belonging to a sect remarkably peaceful, pious and inoffensive. Be so good as to shew the Dean what I have written; he may, perhaps, be induced to respect my suggestions. I am, Sir, yours, &c.

H. NORWICH.

To the Rev. Thomas Rowe, Wesleyan Minister, Lynn.

REVIEW.

"Still pleased to praise, yet not afraid to blame."—POPE.

ART. I.—*Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem. A Picture of Judaism, in the Century which preceded the Advent of our Saviour. Translated from the German of Frederick Strauss, with Notes and Illustrations by the Translator.* London: printed for Mawman. 1824. 2 Vols. Crown 8vo. First Vol. pp. 371. Second Vol. pp. 396.

OF *Helon's Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem*, an abstract may be seen in the eighteenth volume of the *Monthly Repository*:* the article was received from a correspondent, the value of whose communications makes us lament that the number of them is so small, and whose account of the German original, comprehended such a translation of different passages of it, as shews, beyond all doubt, that we are indebted to the same pen for the appearance of the whole in our native language. The anonymous editor has our thanks for rendering the work accessible to English readers: we are persuaded that "it will be found a very pleasing medium of conveying historical, geographical and antiquarian knowledge, and will gratify the taste, while it improves the heart;" and the judicious summary, which he has given of the narrative, more than supersedes the necessity of our representing, at any length, the object of *Helon's Pilgrimage to Jerusalem*—its commencement, stages, incidents, immediate consequences and final issue. It will be our appropriate and pleasing duty to make a few observations upon the several labours of the author and of his translator. In this and in a succeeding number, we shall attend exclusively to the performance of Strauss: hereafter, the version of *Helon's Pilgrimage* will pass under our review.

We cannot be ignorant that some individuals exceedingly dislike the admixture of palpable facts and grave instruction with fictitious events and personages. Yet, in the absence of all intention to deceive, in the attempt

to blend knowledge with delight, and to fix upon the memory dates and names and circumstances, which cannot, by any ordinary methods, be so impressively and successfully communicated, writings of this class seem justifiable, and even praise-worthy. If historical truth is not perverted, if the author's motive is unreservedly stated, and steadily kept in sight, why should a numerous body of readers—why should the young especially—be debarred from the benefit and satisfaction attendant on such familiar, engaging appeals to their taste, and their associations of ideas? It is a capital error to suppose that well-executed volumes in this department of literature can yield no other or higher result than mere amusement. General experience militates against such an opinion: sound criticism refutes it; and, in our own times, some of the most vivid and correct delineations of the manners of rather a distant period, which the pencil of genius has set before us, have possessed greater attractions, and produced a more useful effect, in consequence of their being drawn, as it were, on a canvas already occupied, in part, by an historical painting. Nor can we perceive why the principle and the force of this reasoning should be admitted, as to the supposed adventures of a Greek, a Roman, a Scythian, while the same principle and conclusion are impugned, in respect of the imaginary adventures of an Alexandrine Jew.

Strauss has exercised considerable skill in laying the period of this *pilgrimage* within the interval between the return from the captivity and the birth of Jesus Christ. He is still happier in the specific date* which he has selected. By such an arrangement he shuns any temptation to falsify the narratives of either the Old or the New Testament, and takes his station upon a spot conveniently remote from both. Let us hear what he himself says concerning this branch of his design:

* Pp. 12—22.

* The year A. C. 109.

"The plan now traced, while it offered an opportunity of delineating an interesting change in the sentiments of Helon himself, seemed also to present the means of combining with this a living picture of the customs, opinions and laws of the Jewish people. No period of their history seemed so well adapted to the design of this work, as that of John Hyrcanus. It is about this time that the books of the Maccabees close; it is the last era of the freedom and independence of the people, whose character and institutions at the same time were so nearly developed and fixed, that very little change took place between this and the time of our Saviour. It was possible, therefore, to give a picture which, as far as relates to usages and manners, should be applicable to the times of the New Testament. By selecting this period, it was more easy to avoid the inconvenience of placing fictitious characters in contact with the real personages of history, than if the time of our Saviour had been chosen."—Vol. I. xi.

We shall consider the general plan of *Helon's Pilgrimage*—the developement and catastrophe of the story—the leading characters—the dialogue—the style of narrative and description—the accuracy of the information conveyed, and—the purpose and effect of the whole.

A young and pious Jew of Alexandria, "impatient to keep the sacred festivals at Jerusalem, and to visit the land which had been the scene of the past glories of his nation," sets out on his pilgrimage thither. He is accompanied by his uncle Elisama, a venerable man, full of zeal for the law and its literal interpretation, by a young Greek of the name of Myron, and by Sallu, a faithful slave of Helon's family. The journey to the holy city, is described with considerable minuteness, in respect of the geography, manners and incidents. Iddo, an old friend of Elisama, entertains this band of pilgrims on their arrival: but they are soon called to engage in the solemnities of the Passover, every circumstance of which is impressively placed before the reader. Helon, who, previously to his departure, had ceased to be a *hellenizing* and had become an *Aramean Jew*, now feels an irresistible desire to enter into the order of priests: his request is granted; and, after due probation, he begins to perform his official duties in the temple. At a short interval, he visits Je-

richo, where he is the guest of Selumiel, the brother of Iddo: here, for the first time, he sees, and here he marries, Selumiel's daughter, Sulamith. The bride and the bridegroom repair to Jerusalem, at the feast of Pentecost: then they return to Jericho, and Myron's indiscretion gives birth to a fatal accident, plunges the whole family in the deepest distress, compels Elisama to flee, for safety, to a city of refuge, and, in its effects, so agitates his feeble frame as to deprive him very quickly of life. Myron seeks a reconciliation with his afflicted friend: he obtains it through Sulamith's intercession; but, "ignorant of oriental manners, and of the fury of oriental jealousy," he commits another act of inadvertency, as the consequence of which Helon accuses Sulamith of being unfaithful to her marriage-vow; and she undergoes, with the heroism and perfect triumph of innocence, the ordeal of the *water of jealousy*. These events, keenly painful as they are to the young priest's feelings, exercise, nevertheless, a salutary power on his mind and character, on his religious views and habits. He regains his cheerfulness: he finds himself happier than ever in his domestic union, and in all his prospects. In this state of soul, he celebrates the feast of Tabernacles. When he again reaches Jericho, he hears that the plague has broken out there. The whole party, joined by Myron, who has become a proselyte of the gate, determine on going to Alexandria, and visiting Helon's mother, of whose death, however, they receive information before they can embark from Joppa. Still, they resolve upon the voyage, which for several days is prosperous: suddenly, a storm arises; the vessel strikes upon a rock—and all on board perish. We have retraced the outlines of the story, in order that our remarks on its developement and catastrophe may be better understood. Only the leading incidents have now been recapitulated; many of less importance, but in general probable and pertinent, occur; and there is further interwoven with the narrative a most ample and lively account of nearly every thing which bears upon the personal, the domestic, the civil and ecclesiastical usages of the Jews, at the æra of this pilgrimage—upon the associations

which they connected with their Scriptures, their country, their recollections, their situation and their hopes.

A large portion of the first book, is occupied by an abstract of the history of this people, from the calling of Abraham, down to the priesthood and the reign of John Hyrcanus. Perhaps, too many pages are devoted to the abstract: however, it comes naturally enough from the lips of Elisama, for the information of Myron, and serves to fill up some of the first stages of the journey, which until it brought the pilgrims to the Holy Land, was not likely to be fruitful in events.

In the incidents and transactions which, suddenly and almost simultaneously, cast down Helon from the pinnacle of his bliss to the gulf of sorrow, the writer is extremely inartificial. The circumstances that are designed to prepare us for the deeply mournful catastrophe, follow much too closely on each other: hence probability is violated, and the mind of the reader unnecessarily shocked. It becomes evident that Strauss, having nearly exhausted his materials for descriptions of Jewish scenes, festivals, &c., hurries on his narrative. We cannot otherwise explain his unskilful structure of the last stages of the plot: this is the only manner in which we can account for his putting an end so abruptly to the lives of the chief personages of his story; he cannot or he will not do any more with them—his invention, or rather perhaps his assiduity, flags. Conveniently, no doubt, for himself, but much to the mortification of his readers, he brings before us *homicide, calumniated innocence, the Simoom, the plague, the tempest*, in uninterrupted succession, and makes them the instruments of destroying both *poetical and moral* justice. So far are we from perceiving why Helon and Sulamith might not have been represented as passing together many years of domestic bliss, that we must charge their immature death upon at least a failure of our author's judgment. In the range of fictitious history, and notwithstanding the highly-wrought picture of the wreck of the vessel, we are scarcely acquainted with so unsatisfactory and revolting a conclusion.

Among the characters introduced, that from which these volumes have

their title, is, in every view, deserving of our principal regard. *Helon* must be considered as the author's favourite personage: we even think that he is a sort of representative of *Strauss* himself—a portrait of his intellectual, moral and religious habits. The soul of Helon, appears to be the soul of devotional ardour and sensibility: his mind full of the associations of thought that would characterize a pious and enlightened Jew so situated. Helon is the moving-spring and life of the whole narrative; a fine model of filial, conjugal, relative and patriotic affection. His memory is richly stored with the passages of his country's eventful history: his imagination quickly kindles at the sight of her sacred edifices and ceremonies, and of her grand and consecrated, her beautiful and captivating scenery. Though his enthusiasm sometimes misleads his judgment, he manifests generally a sound understanding, and a just discernment of men and things. We accompany him with lively interest throughout his pilgrimage: we sympathize in his joys and sorrows, and bitterly mourn over what we must, in every view, pronounce his untimely fate. So partial are we to the young pilgrim and priest, that we long to know more of the man,* whose own state of mind would conceive, and whose talents and studies enabled him to create, this hero of the narrative.

Next, in point of importance, and of just design and execution, though still at a very considerable distance, we rank the character of Elisama, whom we may term a Hebrew of the old school, and whose near affinity to Helon, whose maturity of habit and experience, and "multitude of years," are of essential use in the conduct of the narrative, and in bringing about the succession of events. The tragical issue of this pilgrimage, is chiefly occasioned by those properties of Elisama's temper, which, on every account, are the most exceptionable, and which perhaps are yet more prominent in the original than in the translation.

* All the information that we possess in respect of Strauss, is from the Preface, (Translator's,) p. xxii. We presume that he is a Lutheran clergyman, but are ignorant in what part of Germany he resides.

In many respects we acknowledge Elisama as the *Mentor* of the piece; although he is totally wanting in a Mentor's wisdom and self-control, at the moment when they are most requisite.

The character of *Myron* is happily introduced and well sustained. An earlier or a later period of Jewish history would hardly have supplied it, or have enabled the author to have made it equally subservient to the main purpose of his narrative, and to the illustration of a few points of Grecian learning and antiquities. Nothing, of the kind, can be more natural than the intimacy between Helon and Myron: this could not but be formed by their early local residence, their united and congenial studies; notwithstanding the wide diversity of their dispositions, their domestic education and first impressions. Myron's conversion was to be anticipated: still it comes upon us rather by surprise.

What reader of this *Pilgrimage*, can be uninterested in the amiable and engaging *Sulamith*? So pre-eminent is she among the wise and devout and virtuous daughters of Israel, that we grieve to see so little of her, and weep over her short career of domestic felicity and usefulness, the peculiar severity of her trials, and the suddenness of her death.

The portraits of *Selumiel* and *Iddo*, though subordinate and less attractive, are drawn, nevertheless, with some masterly strokes, and with considerable discrimination: that of *Helon's mother* is placed at a still greater distance from the fore-ground, but is equally entitled to our praise.

Nor should the willing and affectionate slave *Sallu* be overlooked: whenever he makes his appearance, it is strictly in season and place and office.

Accuracy and taste have sketched the pictures of *John Hyrcanus*,* the *Essene*,† the *Nazarite*,‡ the *lepers*,§ the *young Jewish soldier*,|| &c.

But we must not finish this part of our review, before we have noticed the *old man of the temple*; a highly

important individual in our author's group of personages, and extremely and peculiarly the creature of his fancy. Whether the portrait of this aged priest (for such he is) be historically correct, we must be allowed to doubt. At the period of the Jewish annals, to which *Helon's Pilgrimage* belongs, some, it is true, were "waiting for the consolation of Israel:" they looked solicitously and fervently for the Messiah; though they could not hope to be the witnesses of his advent. From the Sacred Writings, however, Strauss has no warrant—he has none, we think, even from writings of a more recent date, and a far inferior authority—for supposing that any of the Hebrews, whether of the priesthood or the laity, beheld in the Levitical sacrifices the imagined vicarious sacrifice of Christ. Such typical theology was reserved for other professors of religion, and for other and much later times. The *old man of the temple* is a character suggested by this writer's system of divinity: on this system he is perfectly well supported: he is full of mysticism, and himself a sort of mystical and unearthly being. He does much towards accelerating Helon's reception of those views of religious truth, which he himself so zealously cherishes: and he is thus far not a little instrumental to the progress and moral of the story. By his virtues and his years he has been made truly venerable: towards Helon he evinces a paternal affection and tenderness, which meet with something like filial gratitude, attachment and submission, in return.

In another part of this article we shall have occasion to resume our observations on the Jewish sacrifices and on mystical theology. Meanwhile, we would impress on the recollection of our readers one fact, of singular pertinency and moment, in respect of the animal offerings of the Hebrews: that people were husbandmen and shepherds—altogether pastoral and agricultural; they nourished therefore an immense multitude of cattle, for the use and the food of man. Only a small part of each victim was devoted to the altar; while the rest furnished the meals of the priests and of the several worshipers. Thus, some of the great ends of their religious sepa-

* Vol. I. 277, &c.

† II. 40, &c.

‡ II. 70, &c.

§ VOL. XXI.

† II. 135.

§ II. 224, &c.

ration and of common and daily life, were blended together in the closest union.

N.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—*Hebrew Tales; selected and translated from the Writings of the Ancient Hebrew Sages: to which is prefixed, an Essay on the Uninspired Literature of the Hebrews.* By Hyman Hurwitz, Author of "*Vindiciæ Hebraicæ*," &c. &c. 12mo. pp. 314. Morrison and Watt, Fenchurch Street. 1826.

THIS is a valuable little volume. The author is well known and highly respected. He is one of the few Jews that cultivate letters with ardour, and one of the still fewer that write the English language with propriety and even elegance. This distinction he may owe to his acquaintance with one of the eminent writers of the day, Mr. Coleridge, whom he names with gratitude and respect, and from whose work, "*The Friend*," three of the Tales are borrowed.

Mr. Hurwitz gives the following explanation of the source from which he has derived his Tales:

"They have been selected from the writings of the ancient Hebrews, who flourished in the five first centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem; and are known to the learned by the names of the *Talmud*, *Medrashim*, &c.

"Of the *Talmud*, the principal subject is the Traditional Law, and to this the far larger portion of the work is devoted. But, likewise, there are found in it, dispersed over its multifarious pages, *Sayings* and *Narrations*, under the common name AGADETHA.

"These scattered portions of the *Talmud*, as well as the *Medrashim*, contain, 1st. Explanations of Scriptural texts, and the many and various ways in which the same passages may be interpreted. 2nd. Mystical, and often very curious allusions. 3rd. Philosophical opinions concealed under the veil of Allegory. 4th. Aphorisms and moral sentiments, illustrated by similes and parables, and by narratives, sometimes real and sometimes fictitious. It is to the last class, that I have confined my extracts; and these form the subject matter of the following pages."—Pref. pp. iii, iv.

Our readers will be pleased with a

few specimens of these ancient Hebrew stories. The following is one of those translated by Mr. Coleridge:

"*The Lord helpeth Man and Beast.*"

"During his march to conquer the world, Alexander, the Macedonian, came to a people in Africa who dwelt in a remote and secluded corner in peaceful huts, and knew neither war nor conqueror. They led him to the hut of their chief, who received him hospitably, and placed before him golden dates, golden figs, and bread of gold. 'Do you eat gold in this country?' said Alexander. 'I take it for granted (replied the chief) that thou wert able to find eatable food in thine own country. For what reason, then, art thou come amongst us?' 'Your gold has not tempted me hither,' said Alexander, 'but I would become acquainted with your manners and customs.' 'So be it,' rejoined the other: 'sojourn among us as long as it pleaseth thee.' At the close of this conversation two citizens entered, as into their court of justice. The plaintiff said, 'I bought of this man a piece of land, and as I was making a deep drain through it, I found a treasure. This is not mine, for I only bargained for the land, and not for any treasure that might be concealed beneath it; and yet the former owner of the land will not receive it.' The defendant answered, 'I hope I have a conscience, as well as my fellow-citizen. I sold him the land with all its contingent, as well as existing advantages, and consequently the treasure inclusively.'

"The chief, who was at the same time their supreme judge, recapitulated their words, in order that the parties might see whether or not he understood them aright. Then, after some reflection, said, 'Thou hast a son, friend, I believe?' 'Yes.'—'And thou (addressing the other), a daughter?' 'Yes.'—'Well, then, let thy son marry thy daughter, and bestow the treasure on the young couple for a marriage portion.'

"Alexander seemed surprised and perplexed. 'Think you my sentence unjust?' the chief asked him. 'O, no!' replied Alexander, 'but it astonishes me.'—'And how then,' rejoined the chief, 'would the case have been decided in your country?' 'To confess the truth,' said Alexander, 'we should have taken both parties into custody, and have seized the treasure for the king's use.' 'For the king's use!' exclaimed the chief. 'Does the sun shine on that country?' 'O yes!'—'Does it rain there?' 'Assuredly.'—'Wonderful! But are there tame animals in the country, that live on the grass and green herbs?' 'Very

many, and of many kinds.'—'Aye, that must then be the cause,' said the chief: 'for the sake of those innocent animals, the all-gracious Being continues to let the sun shine, and the rain drop down on your own country; since its inhabitants are unworthy of such blessings.'

"T. TAMID. BERESHITH RABAH.
"VAJEEKRA RABAH."—Pp. 8—10.

We make the next extract, for the sake not only of the tale, but also of the pious observations of the translator, by which it is illustrated:

"Hope, Resignation, and Dependence on the Divine Protection recommended, by the consideration, that even Calamities, as far as they are Dispensations of God, prove at length to have been Blessings in Disguise.—This illustrated in the Life of R. Akiba."

"All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth, unto such as keep his covenants and his testimonies. PSALM XXV.

"Man, with his boasted wisdom, is but a short-sighted creature; and, with all his pretended power, a weak and helpless being.* He knows not in one moment what will happen to him in the next. Nor could such knowledge, were he to possess it, either prevent or retard events over which he has not the least controul. The eminent faculties with which he is gifted may indeed enable him to see the immediate effects of particular occurrences, but the remote consequences and final results, are hidden from his confined view. Hence he often wishes for things, which, were they

* "The futility of our endeavours without the assistance of God, is beautifully expressed in the 127th Psalm. 'Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord guard the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.'

"Every man's own experience may furnish him with examples to verify the truth of this position; but none are more striking than those which are found in Scripture. No doubt, King David, like every other parent, rejoiced at the birth of Absalom, that very son who drove his royal sire from the throne, and embittered the rest of his days.—Jacob deeply lamented and bewailed the absence of Joseph, little thinking, that that very absence was the means of saving him and his family from famine; and that it was a necessary link in the chain of those astonishing events, the mighty influence of which extends even to our days, and whose final results are still hidden in the womb of time."

granted, would tend to his injury; and he as often laments and bewails those very events which ultimately prove to his benefit. Thus circumstanced, he could not possibly escape the numerous dangers that surround him, nay, he would often rush on that very destruction which he seeks to avoid, were it not for the merciful providence of that supreme Being who gave us our existence, who watches over our welfare, and who guides our steps.

"It is HE who delivers us from 'the noxious pestilence which marches in the dark, and from the destruction which rages at noon.' It is HE that turns our mourning into joy, and who changes present evils into everlasting good. 'Happy then the man who has the God of Jacob for his help, and who trusts in the Lord his God.'

"So convinced was Rabbi Akiba of these divine truths, so fully persuaded was he that from the fountain of goodness no real evil can flow, that even under the greatest afflictions and sufferings—and they were many and various—he was accustomed to say—'Whatever God does is for our good.' The ancient Sages of Israel have recommended us to adopt the same maxim; and they have illustrated it by the following narrative.

"Compelled by violent persecution to quit his native land, Rabbi Akiba wandered over barren wastes and dreary deserts. His whole equipage consisted of a lamp, which he used to light at night, in order to study the Law; a cock, which served him instead of a watch, to announce to him the rising dawn; and an ass, on which he rode.

"The sun was gradually sinking beneath the horizon, night was fast approaching, and the poor wanderer knew not where to shelter his head, or where to rest his weary limbs. Fatigued, and almost exhausted, he came at last near a village. He was glad to find it inhabited; thinking where human beings dwelt, there dwelt also humanity and compassion; but he was mistaken. He asked for a night's lodging—it was refused. Not one of the inhospitable inhabitants would accommodate him. He was therefore obliged to seek shelter in a neighbouring wood.—'It is hard, very hard,' said he, 'not to find a hospitable roof to protect me against the inclemency of the weather;—but God is just, and whatever he does is for the best. He seated himself beneath a tree, lighted his lamp, and began to read the law. He had scarcely read a chapter, when a violent storm extinguished the light. 'What,' exclaimed he, 'must I not be permitted even to pursue my favourite study!—But God is

just, and whatever he does is for the best.

"He stretched himself on the bare earth, willing, if possible, to have a few hours' sleep. He had hardly closed his eyes, when a fierce wolf came and killed the cock. 'What new misfortune is this?' ejaculated the astonished Akiba. 'My vigilant companion is gone! Who then will henceforth awaken me to the study of the law? But God is just: he knows best what is good for us poor mortals.' Scarcely had he finished the sentence, when a terrible lion came and devoured the ass. 'What is to be done now?' exclaimed the lonely wanderer. 'My lamp and my cock are gone—my poor ass, too, is gone—all is gone! But, *praised be the Lord, whatever he does is for the best.*' He passed a sleepless night, and early in the morning went to the village, to see whether he could procure a horse, or any other beast of burthen, to enable him to pursue his journey. But what was his surprise, not to find a single individual alive!

"It appears that a band of robbers had entered the village during the night, killed its inhabitants, and plundered their houses. As soon as AKIBA had sufficiently recovered from the amazement into which this wonderful occurrence had thrown him, he lifted up his voice, and exclaimed, 'Thou great God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, now I know by experience that poor mortal men are short-sighted and blind; often considering as evils what is intended for their preservation! But thou alone art just, and kind, and merciful! Had not the hard-hearted people driven me, by their inhospitality, from the village, I should assuredly have shared their fate. Had not the wind extinguished my lamp, the robbers would have been drawn to the spot, and have murdered me. I perceive also that it was thy mercy which deprived me of my two companions, that they might not by their noise give notice to the banditti where I was. Praised, then, be thy name, for ever and ever!'

"T. BERACHOTH."—Pp. 16—21.

We suspect that the following story from "*Medrash Rabba*" is designed as a hint to certain Christian proselytists.

"On Pretended Majorities.

"'It is declared in your law,' said a Heathen once to Rabbi Joshua, 'that in matters where unanimity cannot be obtained, you ought to follow the majority; and you allow that we Heathens are more numerous than you are; then why do you not follow our mode of wor-

ship?' 'Before I answer thy interrogation,' replied the Rabbi, 'permit me to ask thee a question: Hast thou any children?' 'Alas!' exclaimed the Heathen, 'thou remindest me of the greatest of my troubles.'—'Why, what is the matter?' asked Joshua. 'I will tell thee,' replied the Heathen: 'I have many sons: generally speaking, they live pretty peaceably together; but when meal-time arrives, and prayers are to commence, each wishes to adore his God in his own way. One invokes JUPITER, another MARS, another NEPTUNE. Each extols him whom he wishes to adore, and insists on his superiority. From words they often come to blows; so that instead of having a comfortable meal, we have nothing but confusion and quarrels.'—'And why dost thou not endeavour to reconcile them?' asked Joshua. 'I might as well,' said the Heathen, 'attempt to reconcile fire and water, or to smoothen the turbulent waves of the ocean.'—'I truly pity thee,' said the Rabbi; 'thy neighbours are, perhaps, more fortunate?'—'Not at all,' replied the Heathen, 'unless they be childless;—otherwise, the same cause produces the same effect.'—'And yet,' exclaimed Joshua, 'thou callest this a majority—whose worship thou fain wouldst recommend to us! Be advised by me, good man, and before thou attemptest to reconcile others to such a mode of worship, first reconcile the worshipers amongst themselves.'—Pp. 44, 45.

There are both wit and wisdom in the Dialogue of Tale XXX:

"Milton's '*Dark from excess of Light*,'—anticipated and applied by R. Joshua, in answer to a demand of the Emperor Trajan.

"'You teach,' said the Emperor Trajan to Rabbi Joshua, 'that your God is every where, and boast that he resides amongst your nation. I should like to see him.'—'God's presence is indeed every where,' replied Joshua, 'but he cannot be seen; no mortal eye can behold his glory.'—The Emperor insisted. 'Well,' said Joshua, 'suppose we try to look first at one of his ambassadors?'—The Emperor consented.—The Rabbi took him in the open air at noon day, and bid him look at the sun in its meridian splendour.—'I cannot,' said Trajan, 'the light dazzles me.'—'Thou art unable,' said Joshua, 'to endure the light of one of his creatures, and canst thou expect to behold the resplendent glory of the Creator? Would not such a sight annihilate you!'

"T. CHOLIN."—Pp. 84, 85.

No. XLIV., though not a Tale, is a pleasing exposition of one point of Hebrew ethics :

" *The Climax of Benevolence ; or, the Golden Ladder of Charity : from Maimonides,* after the Talmud.*

" There are eight degrees or steps, says Maimonides, in the duty of charity.

" The first and lowest degree is to give,—but with reluctance or regret. This is the gift of the *hand*, but not of the *heart*.

" The second is, to give cheerfully, but not proportionately to the distress of the sufferer.

" The third is, to give cheerfully and proportionably, but not until we are solicited.

" The fourth is, to give cheerfully, proportionably, and even unsolicited ; but to put it in the poor man's hand : thereby exciting in him the painful emotion of shame.

" The fifth is, to give charity in such a way that the distressed may receive the bounty, and know their benefactor, without their being known to him. Such was the conduct of some of our ancestors, who used to tie up money in the hind corners of their cloaks, so that the poor might take it unperceived.

" The sixth, which rises still higher, is to know the objects of our bounty, but remain unknown to them. Such was the conduct of those of our ancestors, who used to convey their charitable gifts into poor people's dwellings ; taking care that their own persons and names should remain unknown.

" The seventh is still more meritorious ; namely, to bestow charity in such a way, that the benefactor may not know the relieved objects, nor they the name of their benefactor. As was done by our charitable forefathers during the existence of the Temple. For there was in that holy building a place called, the *Chamber of Silence or Inostentation* ; wherein the good deposited secretly whatever their generous hearts suggested ; and from which the most respectable poor families were maintained with equal secrecy.†

" Lastly, the eighth and the most meritorious of all, is to anticipate charity, by preventing poverty ; namely, to assist the reduced brother, either by a considerable gift, or a loan of money, or by teaching him a trade, or by putting

him in the way of business, so that he may earn an honest livelihood ; and not be forced to the dreadful alternative of holding up his hand for charity. And to this Scripture alludes, when it says,—' And if thy brother be waxen poor and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt support him : *yea, though he be a stranger or a sojourner ; that he may live with thee.*' Levit. xxv. 35. This is the highest step and the summit of Charity's Golden Ladder."—Pp. 123—125.

The Jews, whether ancient or modern, are misrepresented when they are charged with either ignorance or disbelief of a future state :

" *The Doctrine of Resurrection supported by that of Creation.*

" There were discovered on the fragments of an ancient tombstone, Greek words to the following purpose :—' *I was not, and I became : I am not, but shall be.*' The same thought is expressed in the following reply of R. Gabiha to a Sceptic.

" A Freethinker said once to R. GABIIHA, ' Ye fools, who believe in a resurrection ! See ye not that the living die ?—how then can ye believe that the dead shall live ? ' ' Silly man ! ' replied Gabiha, ' thou believest in a creation.—Well, then, if what never before existed, exists ; why may not that which once existed, exist again ? '—P. 105.

Prefixed to the " Tales " is an " Essay on the still Existing Remains of the Hebrew Sages of a later Period than the Maccabees, and on the Character and Merit of the Uninspired Ancient Hebrew Literature generally." This is an instructive and pleasing attempt to vindicate Rabbinical literature and theology, and to promote sacred learning amongst the writer's own people. He confesses the low state of his nation, both religious and literary, and deplores bitterly the " frightful phenomenon " (p. 13) of Jewish infidelity. He acknowledges that the Talmud " contains many things which every enlightened, nay, every pious Jew, must sincerely wish had either never appeared there, or should at least long ago have been expunged from its pages " (p. 34) ; but he explains at considerable length in what manner the hyperboles and allegories of the Talmudists have been first idly received as literal truths, and then derided as silly fables :

" Another fertile source of misconception originated in that natural fondness

* " Maimonides' Yad Hachazakah, Vol. III."

† " Hence probably the origin of charity-boxes."

for the marvellous—so common to undisciplined minds—of which the Ancient Rabbis sometimes availed themselves with the sole view of exciting the attention of their respective audiences. A particular instance of the kind, we have in *Medrash Shir Hashirim*:—Whilst Rabbi (Rabbi Jehudah the holy) was delivering a sermon to a large congregation, he observed that the people were rather drowsy or inclined to fall asleep. Wishing to rouse them, he exclaimed,—‘*There was a woman in Egypt who brought forth six hundred thousand children at one birth.*’ An assertion so extraordinary was enough to rouse the most lethargic. The people stared, and looked amazed. One of the Rabbi’s disciples asked him for an explanation; when the Rabbi replied, that he merely alluded to *Jochebed*, who brought forth a son (Moses) whose personal worth, and whose influence, as the chosen messenger of God, was equal to that of six hundred thousand other individuals.

“Now let us suppose that the pious Preacher had omitted the explanation, or that the collector of the Rabbi’s opinions had noted his words without the interpretation, and that the assertion had thus found an entrance into the Talmud. What would have followed? Assuredly, this:—That the devotees of the dark ages would have taken it as matter of fact, would have firmly believed it, and that for the best of all reasons, because, how else could so holy a man as Rabbi Jehudah have asserted it?—Common sense might, indeed, urge the improbability of the event, but her feeble voice might easily have been silenced, by considering the assumed fact as a Miracle! And if one of those devotees had happened to be a *Rabbi*, a compiler of the Traditional Law, he would as assuredly have inserted it in the long list of equally well-grounded religious tenets: and consequently, every poor ignorant Israelite would have considered it as an article of faith, and would have firmly believed that there was a woman in Egypt who had six hundred thousand children at a birth! Who would have dared to deny it? Who would have had the courage to question it? And the half-enlightened man would, in spite of authority, consider it as a silly fable, and not only despise it, but despise the very books into which such an absurdity could have found insertion. Thus we see how a simple unexplained assertion would alternately give rise to the most gross superstition, and the most unmerited scorn; and finally cover religion with disgrace, and the words of the wise with ridicule. Truly judicious, therefore, was the advice of one of our

ancient sages—‘Ye wise men, be careful of your words, lest ye be doomed to captivity, and be banished to a place of infected waters, which succeeding disciples may drink and perish, and the name of God will be profaned.’”—Note, pp. 35—37.

In reply to the charge that many of the Talmudic laws militate against humanity, Mr. Hurwitz says,

“I admit that the Talmud contains several passages, directed against idolatrous Heathens, that cannot be reconciled to the dictates of impassionate judgment, or indeed be palliated by a humane man as general principles, or in ignorance of the provocations in which they originated. And these passages are the more remarkable, since they are in evident contradiction to that universal charity and good-will towards mankind which is so strongly recommended in the Talmud. But before we pass the sentence of condemnation against the authors of that work, let us reflect who the men were against whom those severe laws were directed. Let us not forget that they were the implacable enemies of the Hebrews—that they polluted the holy sanctuary—desolated the country—slaughtered its inhabitants, and covered the land with mourning. Let the reader, of whatever persuasion he may be, read the books of the Maccabees—then let him for a moment suppose himself to be one of those unfortunate Israelites, who were made to drink the bitter cup of affliction to its very dregs. Let him imagine that he saw his country laid waste—that he beheld with his own eyes a venerable father weltering in blood—a beloved mother, or a favourite sister suspended on a tree, with innocent babes hanging round their necks—and all this for no crime, but only for steadily adhering to the institutions of their forefathers—and let him lay his hand on his heart and say—conscientiously say, what he would think of those Heathens, those savage monsters, who with fiend-like ferocity fell upon a peaceable and unoffending people: then let him determine the degree of asperity with which he can blame the ancient Rulers of Israel for enacting a few severe laws against their unrelenting enemies; and that perhaps at the very moment when their wounds were still bleeding.

“But whatever may be thought of those laws, let it not be forgotten that they are fully counterbalanced by others of a more beneficent character. ‘It is our duty,’ says the Talmud, ‘to maintain the Heathen poor, with those of our own nation.’—‘We must visit their sick

and administer to their relief, bury their dead,' &c.—'The Heathens that dwell out of the land of Israel ought not to be considered as Idolaters; as they only follow the customs of their fathers.'—'The pious men of the Heathens,' says Rabbi Joshua, 'will have their portions in the next world.'—These charitable sentiments, and numerous others of similar tendency, have been overlooked, whilst a few inimical passages have been selected and exhibited in a strong and false light. So true it is that—

"Men's evil manners live in brass;
their virtues

We write in water."—Pp. 50—53.

Mr. Hurwitz acknowledges and laments that in gloomy times a knowledge of the Talmud was considered equally and even more necessary than a knowledge of the Bible, but he anticipates and hails a better era, with all the ardour of a religious reformer.

"Aware of the evils resulting from a system so absurd, the celebrated *Mendelashon*, and his learned friend *Hartog Wesely* (author of the *Mosaid*, &c. &c.), employed their great talents to counteract and remedy them. To effect this, and to wean his brethren from the corrupt jargon they had adopted in the days of tribulation, the former published his excellent German translation of the Pentateuch and Psalms; and the latter wrote several Tracts, in which he condemned the modes of instruction then in vogue, and recommended a more judicious system. Many were the obstacles with which these eminent men had to contend. The nation was not sufficiently enlightened to appreciate the transcendent merit of their benefactors. The bigots of those days were all up in arms against these two great Instructors of Israel, and repaid their important services by considering and treating them as heretics! Nevertheless, truth gradually made its way, and triumphed at last. It is to the labours of these two pious Philosophers, aided by the laudable exertion of several learned Jews and noble-minded Christians, that the Israelites of Germany and Holland owe, in a great measure, the rapid advancement in literature, arts, and sciences, by which they begin to distinguish themselves."—*Note*, p. 58.

What will "Orthodox" Christians say of the author's defence of the Talmudists against the charge of superstition with regard to Demons?

"But the Talmudists, it is said, 'believed in the existence of demons,' &c. &c. And suppose they did? Less than three

centuries ago, who did not? The sagest and most learned of Europe would have reprobated the denial as a presumptuous innovation. And must they therefore have been fools and idiots?

It is well known that the existence of demons was not only the popular belief, but was entertained by the wisest men of antiquity, Plato himself not excepted. That the Jews should have adopted the same error is not at all to be wondered at. Now, as we neither despise the learning of Aristotle, though, in common with other philosophers, he believed that the heavenly bodies were all animated, living beings;—nor the wisdom of Socrates and Plato, though they believed in the existence of demons, I do not see why the Talmudists alone should be derided and despised for having adopted and asserted similar opinions."—Pp. 75, 76.

In the Essay, Mr. Hurwitz has given various examples of Talmudic comments on the Holy Scriptures. Some of these are fanciful, but they breathe a spirit of piety and humanity. We extract one specimen, less for its ingenuity than for the pathetic apostrophe with which it concludes:

"*And thou shalt grope at noon-day, as the blind gropes in the dark.*" (Deut. xxviii. 29.) The word, *in the darkness*, appears redundant. This Rabbi *Jose* remarked, and said (to use his own words)—'All my days did I feel pain at not being able to explain this verse. For what difference can it be to the blind man, whether he walketh in the light, or in the dark?' And yet the sacred penman would not have put down a word unnecessarily. What then does it mean? This the Rabbi did not know—and it gave him pain—'Till one night,' continues the sage, 'as I was walking in the road, I met a blind man with a lighted torch in his hand. Son, said I, why dost thou carry that torch? Thou canst not see its light!' 'Friend,' replied the unfortunate man, 'true it is, I cannot see it, but others can:—as long as I carry this lighted torch in my hand, the sons of men see me, take compassion of me, apprize me of danger, and save me from pitfalls, from thorns and briars.' The Rabbi was then satisfied that the apparently superfluous word was meant to depict the greatness of the calamities that were to befall the Jewish nation. Its unfortunate members were not only to grope about like the blind—but like the blind in the darkness!—Without a ray of light to exhibit their distress, and without a pitying eye to take compassion of them!

"And O, thou unfortunate daughter

of Judah! How truly, alas! has this malediction, denounced against thee above three thousand years ago, been verified during thy eighteen hundred years of sad pilgrimage! How truly is it still verifying in many countries! The light of knowledge shines with resplendent lustre, but it shines not for thee!—Loud, and sweetly too, does humanity plead the cause of wretchedness; but it pleads not for thee. The benign eye of Benevolence darts its vivifying looks every where, but it regards not thee. Thou alone—thou once great amongst nations—thou art still derided, despised, and neglected! For thee eloquence is dumb—compassion deaf—and pity blind. But despair not, Israel! The same awful voice that denounced the malediction, did also promise thee happier days. It rests with thee—with thee alone. ‘Return unto me, and I will return unto you, says the Lord of Hosts.’ Mal. iii.”—Pp. 69—71.

ART. III.—*Golden Sentences; a Manual that may be Used by all who desire to be Moral and Religious.* Selected by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, F. A. S. 12mo. pp. 88. Bath, printed by Crutwell; sold by R. Hunter, St. Paul’s Churchyard, London. 1826. 4s.

WE rejoice to see a taste reviving for our older practical Christian writers. Mr. Hunter has selected the names of a few of the most worthy, and has given a series of extracts from their choicest works. His authors are Bishop Hall, Thomas Fuller, Sir Thomas Browne, Dr. Whichcote and Dr. Richard Lucas. The extracts are not “excerpts from continuous compositions; but each is a finished and perfect whole.” They are from Bishop Hall’s “Select Thoughts;” Fuller’s “Good Thoughts in Bad Times;” Sir Thos. Browne’s “Christian Morals;” Dr. Whichcote’s “Aphorisms;” and Dr. Lucas’s “Practical Christianity.” “Biographical Sketches,” drawn with peculiar felicity, “are prefixed to each fasciculus.” We shall give one portion of each author.

Bishop Hall. “He had need to be well underlaid, that knows how to entertain the time and himself with his own thoughts. Company, variety of employments, or recreations, may wear out the day with the emptiest hearts; but, when a man hath no society but of himself, no task to set himself upon, but what arises from his own bosom, surely,

if he have not a good stock of former notions, or an inward mint of new, he shall soon run out of all, and as some forlorn bankrupt grow weary of himself. Hereupon it is, that men of barren and unexercised hearts, can no more live without company, than fish out of the water. And those heremites and other votaries, which, professing only devotion, have no mental abilities to set themselves on work, are fain to tire themselves, and their unwelcome hours, with the perpetual repetitions of the same orisons, which are now grown to a tedious and heartless formality. Those contemplative spirits that are furnished with gracious abilities, and got into acquaintance with the God of heaven, may, and can, lead a life even in the closest restraint, or wildest solitariness, nearest to Angelical; but those, which neither can have *Mary’s* heart, nor will have *Martha’s* hand, must needs be unprofitable to others and wearisome to themselves.”—Pp. 9, 10.

Fuller. “I heard a preacher take for his text, *Am not I thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine, unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee?* I wondered what he would make thereof, fearing he would starve his auditors for want of matter; but hence he observed,

“1. The silliest and simplest, being wronged, may justly speak in their own defence.

“2. Worst men have a good title to their own goods: *Balaam* a sorcerer, yet the ass confesseth twice he was his.

“3. They who have done many good offices, and fail in one, are often not only unrewarded for former service, but punished for that one offence.

“4. When the creatures, formerly officious to serve us, start from their wonted obedience, as the earth to become barren, and air pestilential, man ought to reflect on his own sin as the sole cause thereof.

“How fruitful are the seeming barren places of Scripture: bad ploughmen, which make balks of such ground. Wheresoever the surface of God’s word doth not laugh and sing with corn, there the heart thereof within is merry with mines, affording, where not plain matter, hidden mysteries.”—Pp. 26, 27.

Sir Thomas Browne’s Evening Hymn.

“The night is come. Like to the day
Depart not thou, great God, away:
Let not my sins, black as the night,
Eclipse the lustre of thy light:
Keep still in my horizon; for to me
The sun makes not the day, but Thee.
Thou, whose nature cannot sleep,
On my temples sentry keep;

Guard me 'gainst those watchful foes,
Whose eyes are open while mine close :
Let no dreams my head infest,
But such as Jacob's temples blest.
While I do rest, my soul advance ;
Make my sleep a holy trance,
That I may, my rest being wrought,
Awake into some holy thought,
And with as active vigour run
My course, as doth the nimble sun.
Sleep is a death ! O make me try,
By sleeping, what it is to die :
And as gently lay my head,
On my grave, as now my bed.
Howe'er I rest, great God, let me
Awake again at last with thee :
And thus assured, behold I lie
Securely, or to wake, or die.
These are my drowsy days ; in vain
I do now wake to sleep again :
O come the hour when I shall never
Sleep again, but wake for ever."—P. 50.

Dr. Whichcote. "1. The pleasures of sense ; 2. the prevalence of bodily temper ; 3. the allurements of pleasure, gain and honour from without ; 4. the presence of the things of this life, and this world ; the absence of the things of the other life, and the other world ; 5. the great improvement necessary to a higher life, the no improvement necessary to this ; 6. the depravation of our principles by ill use ;—these things make it hard to live religiously."—P. 62.

Dr. Lucas. "A black cloud makes the traveller mend his pace, and mind his home : whereas a fair day and a pleasant way waste his time, and that stealth away his affections in the prospect of the country. However others may think of it, yet I take it as a mercy that now and then some clouds do interpose my sun, and many times some troubles do eclipse my comforts ; for I perceive, if I should find too much friendship in my inn, in my pilgrimage, I should soon forget my father's house, and my heritage."—Pp. 70, 71.

A Postscript is commonly said to contain the marrow of a letter, and we have an "Addendum," which contains the most interesting passage in this pleasing selection. The reader will be gratified with having it placed before him entire, together with the biographical preface.

"OLIVER HEYWOOD. [Born 1629, died 1702.] One of the last survivors of the race of Puritan ministers, and one of the links which connect English Puritanism with English Presbyterian Dissent. His birth was at Bolton in Lancashire, in the very focus of northern

Puritanism. His father's house was pillaged, when Prince Rupert crossed Lancashire in his march to York. While at Cambridge, he says, in some private and unpublished Memoirs of his Life, that he preferred Perkins, Bolton, Preston, and Sibbs, far above Aristotle, Plato, Magyrus, and Wendeton ; and he brought, in consequence, from the University, a mind in which religious and Christian feeling was predominant.

"He received ordination to the ministry from a classis of Presbyterian ministers ; and, during the time of the Commonwealth, settled as curate of Coley, one of the twelve chapels of the parish of Halifax, in Yorkshire. He declined to comply with the terms of the Act of Uniformity, but resided near the place in which he had been the public minister ; and continued to exercise his ministry, though sometimes in exile, and sometimes a prisoner.

"His published writings have met with the fate which usually attends works which are addressed rather to particular classes of men, than to the world at large. But he left behind him a great mass of writing of a more private and personal nature, (for he suffered no occurrence to pass by him unimproved,) now more valuable than any thing which he committed to the press. It forms the finest materials for a curious biographical memoir, if in the hands of one who could look with a philosophical eye upon the general character of the body to which he belonged, and the peculiar features of his own character, as they were brought out by the remarkable circumstances in which he was placed at different periods of his eventful life. This ought to be done, for he was no common man. One specimen of his mode of remarking on passing events is here given : there is a deep and solemn pathos running through it. The subject was the death of a young woman, daughter of one of his most intimate friends, who was drowned while attempting to cross a brook swollen with rains, near his own home. It is here given rather as a literary curiosity. Whoever will compare it with the reflections of Davie Deanes, in somewhat similar circumstances, as they are represented by the author of the 'Heart of Mid Lothian,' will see how accurately he has caught the manners and sentiments of the people and the times.

"AND now, my soul, what personal improvement dost thou make of this severe and astonishing Providence ? Surely, herein God hath declared his sove-

reignty, in plucking such a lovely flower by so sad and sudden a blow. He that sitteth upon the flood, hath swept away a beautiful virgin with a flood. God, that sitteth upon many waters, and saith to the proud waves, 'Hitherto shall ye go, and no further,' was able to have carried her through the water, and to have secured her from drowning; but he gave commission to that merciless element to hurry her down and choke her. Her will was left to venture upon apparent danger, after she had but crossed it with difficulty. God denied strength to the beast to wrestle out, and prevented the efficacy of help: God thought fit to secure the horse, not her: it was an act of his prerogative and justice. Oh, dreadful blow! Oh, astonishing spectacle! A fresh, lively young woman, likely to live many years, snatched away on a sudden, laid by as a dead corpse in a few moments! Yea, a praying, hopeful child of a pious, praying, gracious father, and a precious mother, long since with God. What shall we say? God is righteous, yet mysterious in his Providences. Thy righteousness, O Lord, is like the great mountains; who can reach the top? Thy judgments are a great deep; who can fathom the bottom thereof? They are sometimes unaccountable, always holy and righteous. It's true, cloud and darkness are round about him; but righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne. The great God doth what he pleaseth in heaven, in earth, in the seas, and all deep places; and sometimes gives not the creatures account of his matters. He taketh away, who can hinder him? Who will say unto him, What doest thou? It becomes us silently to adore his infinite majesty, and lie down under his wise providences. He taketh but his own. Our borrowed comforts must be cheerfully restored: our dearest relations are more his than ours; and, when they have done their work, it becomes us to lay hands off, and let God take them. Nor must we prescribe to him by what death he shall remove them: in the soft waves, or in a soft bed; by lingering consumption, or sudden suffocation; by a slight river, or in the main ocean. To God, the Lord, belong the issues of death, and from death. But, surely, there is a peculiar hand and end of God in pitching on this person, an eminent Christian's dear child: making them the talk of the country, the scorn of the wicked, at such a time as this, when our meetings are despised and afresh prosecuted. Who can tell what misrepresentations profane men may make of this? Who knows how

many will take occasion to harden their hearts herefrom, and insult over us all with madness? Lord, teach thy servants the meaning of thy rod, and give all that see and hear thereof the sanctified use thereof; especially let the death of this young woman be the spiritual life of young persons. Oh, that others may hear, and fear, and do no more wickedly. The time is observable, when youth think they are let loose to be vain, wanton, profane,—this Christmas time, as they call it; and think, by the birth of Jesus, they are delivered to do all their abominations. Oh, blasphemy! Lord, let this be a check to sin, a spur to holiness. If God be so severe to his own children, what shall become of stubborn and rebellious children? If these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry? God Almighty, dry up the flood of licentiousness that drowns the world, lest a flood of wrath overflow us. Oh, what cause have I to admire distinguishing Providence to me and mine! What dangers have I escaped! what deliverances have I enjoyed! My more than ordinary wanderings have exposed me to many seen, but more unseen, hazards; but hitherto God hath helped."—Pp. 75—79.

ART. IV.—*The Necessity of Philosophy to the Divine. A Sermon, preached at Bridgewater, at the Primary Visitation of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, on Wednesday, the 31st of August, 1825.* By John Matthew, M. A., Rector of Kilve and Stringston, Somerset, and late Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford. 8vo. pp. 36. Bridgewater, printed by J. Poole and Son; sold by Rivingtons, London. 1825.

WE hear that this discourse has produced a great impression in the West of England, and we are not surprised at the fact. That a clergyman should assert in a Visitation Sermon the absolute necessity of the use of reason in matters of religion, and moreover attack some of those popular doctrines which are thought to constitute the essence of religion and the distinction of the Established Church, is not a little alarming to such members of the hierarchy as reckon absolute uniformity to be one of the signs of the true church, and to all such professors of Christianity, whether in or out of the pale of the Establishment,

as hold faith to be meritorious in proportion as it is above reason, and esteem mystery one of the marks of revealed truth.

We are not ashamed or afraid to avow that we think that the "Rector of Kilve and Stringston" has made out his case, and proved "the necessity of Philosophy to the Divine." By "philosophy" we would be understood to mean reason or good sense, and by the "Divine" the Christian student. Mr. Matthew indeed takes narrower ground, and is somewhat hampered by the limits which he sets to himself. He deduces from his argument the indispensableness of a sacred order of teachers, prepared for their function by a peculiar education: but if it be necessary that all Christians should understand their religion and receive it, not in implicit faith, but from the conviction of the understanding, it is equally necessary that all Christians should use their reason in the interpretation of their religion, and in judging of the interpretations of it by its professed teachers: and to this point we humbly think the preacher would come, if he were at liberty to follow up his thoughts and lay open his whole mind.

Mr. Matthew argues "the necessity of philosophy to the Divine" whether he treat of the Characters, the Precepts or the Doctrines of Revelation; since, without philosophy, or as we would rather say, good sense, he may mistake the examples set forth in holy writ, may take peculiar rules for general laws, and may receive as articles of faith tenets which contradict both reason and the senses and tend at once to dishonour God and mislead man.

It will be seen by the following extracts that the preacher before the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells did not fear ecclesiastical censure or confutation from his own acknowledged articles of faith, in disavowing and reprobating the doctrines of personal election and of the depravity of human nature.

"You will allow me to apply a similar mode of reasoning to another tenet, which is cherished with as fond an affection by a different class of Literal Religionists; I mean, the shocking and tremendous doctrine of an eternal and an irrelative

Predestination. That a human being *ought not*, without any demerit of his own, to be consigned, by an absolute and an irreversible decree, to eternal and intolerable torments, is as immediately evident to our understandings, as any fact attested by our senses, or any proposition that our imaginations are capable of forming. And, if this truth is so manifest to minds like ours, it must, at least, be equally clear to intelligencies of greater strength and of more accurate discernment. If, then, the Supreme Ruler of the Universe could be conceived to be the author of a dispensation so repulsive even to our inevitable judgment, as this, with which Enthusiasts charge him, he must act in opposition to his sense of justice, to his moral nature, to his clear perception of what is right, I had almost said, to his *conscience*. And he must, in that case, be worse than the most corrupted of his creatures. For he cannot be *tempted with evil*: he cannot be seduced by passion, or blinded with ignorance. He must, therefore, be cruel from the mere love of cruelty, unjust from a cool preference of injustice. He must find amusement in beholding the tortures, and his ears must be delighted with the wailings of his unoffending and unresisting victims.—Now this is a consequence too horrible to be steadily contemplated. Let then the construction of those texts of St. Paul, on which this execrable doctrine is founded, be as plain and as simple as it may; yet are we quite certain, that this could never be the real meaning of the Apostle. Because the tenet is, in its nature, palpably false, intuitively absurd, metaphysically impossible. And we ought to feel our common sense and our reason affronted and degraded by the attempt to establish it on the authority of divine inspiration."—Pp. 24—26.

"And I will only advert to one opinion more, of a similar character, flowing from the same prolific source of error; the conviction that is so tenaciously embraced by some elementary expositors of scripture, concerning the radical corruption, the utter depravity of our common nature.—This doctrine the man whose attention has been at all directed to the Philosophy of Mind, immediately and confidently pronounces to be untrue; because he knows it to be contrary to fact and to experience. Fallen, as he allows himself to be; yet does his unerring consciousness perceive within him many a generous, many a noble quality: he feels in his bosom a multitude of kindly affections both private and public: he knows that he is influenced in his con-

duct by a lively sense of shame, and by an eager desire of the approbation of the wise and good: his heart assures him, that he admires and loves integrity and truth, and that he despises and detests every thing that is opposed to them: nor can he be mistaken in believing, what his hourly experience teaches him, that he is capable of venerating and adoring the great Author and Governor of Nature, in his works and in his Providences.—And in all this is there nothing good?—Is it all *bestial*, all *devilish*?—Must it not excite our wonder, as well as our compassion, to behold, as we have frequent opportunities of doing, a man of qualities truly estimable, truly amiable, both of mind and of heart, earnestly contending, from an erroneous, because too literal a construction of certain assertions of the inspired writers, that his nature, in spite of all the fair appearances we have mentioned, is, to use the coarse language of the sect, *one mass of corruption, rotten to the very core*.—A religionist of this gloomy complexion will strenuously maintain, that he is himself incapable of every virtuous sentiment, and a slave to every degrading propensity; though he feels at the moment, the loveliest charities alive and active in his bosom; though he knows he should be always ready to devote his time, his talents, and his property, to any promising scheme of benevolence; though he is sure he would rather die a thousand deaths, than be guilty of a single action of dishonour.”—Pp. 26—28.

Such sermons as this are valuable, not only in so far as they expose prevailing errors and follies, but likewise as being proofs of the inutility and vanity of Articles “for avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching True Religion.”

ART. V.—*A Lecture, delivered at the Bishop-street School-room, Portsea; November 3rd, 1825; occasioned by some Allusions made in Clarence-street Chapel to other Places of Worship, in the Address there given, at the Previous Monthly Missionary Prayer Meeting. With an Appendix of Letters relative to Missionary Occurrences.* By John Brent. Printed by D. B. Price, Portsmouth; sold by D. Eaton, London. Svo. Pp. 36. 1s.

AN honest protest against bigotry! The Lecturer was present at a meeting in which a Reverend speaker

denounced certain congregations in the neighbourhood as destitute of the gospel. He addressed a letter of complaint to the orator, and received an apology, and afterwards made the affair a topic of pulpit-discourse.

The Lecture contains some good thoughts on gospel-preaching. Mr. Brent observes that “there is a preaching of the gospel by doing as well as speaking,” and, in this connexion, introduces the following anecdotes of Mr. (afterwards Dr.) WREN:

“In the teaching or preaching the pure gospel by *doing*, there were acts done by Mr. THOMAS WREN (afterwards Dr. Wren), minister of High-street chapel, which threw all the others far into the shade. During that unjust, cruel, and murderous war waged by this country against the American provinces, the fate of war (as is usual) threw many Americans into this country as prisoners (then called rebels), and whose lives were spared, most likely, only from the fear of retaliation. There is always misery enough attending on the condition of prisoners of war, but generally most so in civil wars. Yet Dr. Wren, regardless of the frowns of power, and the side looks and sneers of churchmen and professors of other sects, entered the prison doors, comforted, cheered and assisted those sufferers, opened channels of communication for them with their friends, and did them many kind offices; for which I believe it was that he was honoured with, and received from America, the title of Doctor. But I never heard of one of the other ministers *so* preaching the pure gospel.

“There was another instance of his preaching well. At a time when, from real or imaginary grievances, an enraged regiment of Highlanders took military possession of the town, suspended the authorities, and their officers sought their own safety by secreting themselves; amidst the alarm and terror that existed, Mr. Wren first and alone entered their ranks, amidst their charged guns and brandished swords, soothed their minds, calmed their passions, and brought them to attend to reason, and paved the way for adjustment. Yet this man, forsooth, is glanced at as not preaching the pure gospel.”—Pp. 24—26.

ART. VI.—*A Sermon on the Spirituality of the Kingdom of Christ.* By Edward Whitfield. 12mo. pp. 24. Ilminster, printed by J. Moore; sold by Fox and Co., London. 1825.

THE design of this Sermon is to prove and illustrate a maxim of Paley's, taken for a motto, that, "a religious establishment is no part of

Christianity." It is a sensible and temperate discourse, and lays open, in our view, the vital principle of Protestant Nonconformity.

OBITUARY.

1826. March 2, at *Tiverton, Devon*, the Rev. JOHN FOLLETT, aged 83. He was upwards of forty years sole pastor of the congregation of Independent Dissenters in that town, where he settled on leaving the Academy at *Daventry*, in the year 1764, and continued to preach occasionally until 1816, when a fit of apoplexy laid him aside from public usefulness; for although his health recovered and he retained the vigour of his faculties to the last, he could not be prevailed on again to trust himself in the pulpit. His life was a long one, and while his piety and liberality rendered it useful and exemplary, his constitutional cheerfulness rendered it a happy life. As a preacher he was remarkable for great animation and peculiarly forcible modes of expression. In his sentiments, Calvinism, (if such it was to be called,) was moderated, particularly in later life, as much by the course of his reflections as by the benevolence of his disposition. He was once married, but lost his partner, and had no children. But he was a "father to the poor," (to whose service he scrupulously devoted a third part of his income,) and he might almost be said to have sustained that relation towards several young persons, whom the confidence of friendship or the claims of kindred had intrusted to his charge, and by whom his memory is embalmed with tears of grateful recollection. As a trustee to several public institutions he was distinguished by his punctuality and scrupulous exactness in the transaction of business. His constitution was not originally strong, but by exercise, the constant practice of early rising, and that habitual self-government by which the truly pious mind is brought sooner or later to acquiesce with tranquil composure in all the chequered events of life, his days were (under the blessing of Providence) prolonged to an unusual length, and continued bright and sunny to the last. The following letter, written in his 82nd year, will give the reader a correct idea of the cast of his mind and the state of his feelings, particularly in advancing life. It was addressed to a young female friend holding the highly important and responsible situation of the mother of a numerous family, and is here inserted in the hope that it may

gratify and instruct such of your readers as may sustain a similar relation.

Maidstone, April 25, 1826. G. K.

Tiverton, October 19, 1824.

My dear Mrs. —,

Although you have made me so deeply your debtor by the letter you favoured me with, and although I longed to say how highly you gratified me by the pleasing account you gave me of the healthy and flourishing state of your numerous offspring, yet (would you believe it?) I went so far to indulge my lazy fit that I had desired my niece to become my respondent to you, and to assign my advanced age and growing infirmities as the cause of my silence; yet conscience proved upon this occasion so powerful an accuser that I found I could not silence its remonstrances, till I resolved with my own pen to thank you for your late communication, and to say how sincerely I united with you in the hope that your children would support honourable and useful characters in the world through which they are to make their way. They will, I doubt not, be favoured with the best of blessings, good examples, to impress deeply on the mind the best of instructions, and thus be rendered happy in themselves, a comfort to their beloved parents, and a blessing to the world. As a wife, the mistress of a family, and the mother of so numerous a progeny, it must be acknowledged that you are placed in a very respectable and responsible situation, and you will need great wisdom, strength and fortitude, to enable you to meet and bear up under all the trials to which your important situation will necessarily subject you. But great as you will find your wants on this occasion to be, I am persuaded, my dear friend, you have long ere this learned where to apply for these invaluable blessings, and that you are at all times, and upon all occasions, confiding and rejoicing in the interposition of a Providence whose wisdom never errs, and whose bounty can never be exhausted. It is true that sometimes we may be led through thorny paths, or we may be tossed about on the ocean of life by winds and waves, yet mercy is intended by every dispensation; and could we see the design of all God's

dealings with us, we should readily acknowledge that, although we are led a *roundabout way*, it is most certainly the *right way* to the city of habitation. The longer I live the more do I see reason to pity those who live without God in the world, for I have found by long and delightful experience, that by realizing a present Deity, by seeing and acknowledging his hand in all the works of creation and providence, and by holding frequent and intimate communion with my heavenly Father, I find myself elevated above the untoward accidents of life, rendered nobly indifferent to the station (whether high or low) in which the Great Disposer of human affairs may think fit to place me, and when my faith is in very lively exercise, can even look death itself in the face with tranquillity, cheered by the sweet influence of hope, grounded on the discoveries and promises of the gospel. To strengthen my mind in the wisdom and goodness of the Divine administration, I have found it of vast use to look back frequently on the way I have travelled and to review in retirement any remarkable interpositions of Providence which I have recorded, for the purpose, as they occurred. For they prove to my satisfaction the truth of an overruling and particular Providence, a persuasion that took deep root in the bosom of the good Mrs. Cappe, and awakened those devout sentiments of gratitude and trust which animated that zeal in the service of God and man, which hath rendered her the object of esteem and love of an admiring world. To the care of this Providence I recommend you and yours, and with kind regards to your beloved partner,

I am yours, &c.,
JOHN FOLLETT.

April 4, at his house, in *Somers Town*, Mr. WILLIAM SEWARD HALL, a relation of the late Miss Seward's, and many years Secretary to the Royal Maternity Charity, for delivering poor women at their own houses. Mr. Hall was a firm and steady friend to the Unitarian system of Christianity, which he had embraced some years ago from a conviction of its truth and accordance with the Scriptures. He was on terms of friendship with Mr. Winchester and the late Mr. Vidler, and was well known and much respected by many persons in the Unitarian connexion.

He did all he could to disseminate the truth as it is in Jesus, and, which is his greatest praise, he combined in his own person, precept and example too! He quitted life with serene hope and pious resignation, in the full assurance of reaping hereafter the fruits of virtue and holiness. He fought the good fight, he kept the faith, and henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness that shall abide for ever.

Lately, at his house, the *College*, in *Derby*, aged 80, DANIEL PARKER COKE, Esq., descended from an ancient family at *Trusley*, in that county. He was the only son of Thomas Coke, Esq., barrister-at-law, and Dorothy, daughter and heiress of Thomas Goodwin, Esq., of the same place, who were married at All Saints' Church, in *Derby*, in the year 1736. Daniel Parker, their only son, was born July 17, 1745, and was educated under the Rev. Thomas Manlove, whom he afterwards presented with the living of St. Alkmund, in *Derby*. In the year 1762, he was admitted of All Souls' College, Oxford, and during his residence there, attended the lectures of Doctors Blackstone and Beever, whose discourses (as then delivered) he committed to writing in several quarto volumes, Dr. Beever's lectures being valuable, the introductory one only having been published. Mr. Coke was afterwards called to the bar, and for many years attended the midland circuit. In 1775, he stood a contested election for his native town, against John Gisborne, Esq. Mr. Gisborne being elected by a majority of fourteen votes; but in consequence of a petition to the House of Commons, Feb. 8, 1776, Mr. Coke was by the Committee declared to have been duly elected. In 1780, he was returned for the town of Nottingham jointly with Robert Smith, Esq., now Lord Carrington, and continued to represent that place for seven successive parliaments, and retired from the representation in 1812, having held his seat in the House for thirty-eight years. Mr. Coke has frequently taken an active part in the House of Commons, particularly during the administration of Lord North. At the close of the American war he was appointed one of the commissioners for settling the American claims, but which employment he shortly resigned.—*New Monthly Magazine*.

INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC. RELIGIOUS.

British and Foreign Unitarian Association.

THE Anniversary of this Institution will be held on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in Whitsun week, the 16th, 17th and 18th of May.

On Tuesday evening the General Committee will meet the Deputies of District Associations at the rooms in Walbrook Buildings at Six o'clock.

On Wednesday morning the General Meeting for Business will be held at Finsbury Chapel, to which Individual Subscribers, Deputies of District Associations, Representatives of Congregations and Honorary Members are respectfully invited. The Chair to be taken at Twelve o'clock.

On the evening of the same day a Sermon will be preached in Finsbury Chapel by the Rev. LANT CARPENTER, LL.D., of Bristol, in aid of the funds of the Association: divine service to commence at half-past Six o'clock.

On Thursday morning a second Sermon will be preached, also in aid of the funds of the Association, by the Rev. JAMES TAYLER, of Nottingham: divine service to commence at Twelve o'clock.

After this service, the subscribers and their friends will dine together at the *Crown and Anchor Tavern*, in the Strand. [For further particulars, see the Wrapper.]

Annual Meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society.

On Friday, March 24, was held at Manchester, the Annual Meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society. In the morning, the Rev. A. Bennett, late of Poole, who has recently been engaged by the Society as a permanent Missionary, preached in the Cross-Street Chapel a sermon from 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. The attendance was respectable and numerous, and the sermon was heard with that deep attention and interest which it merited. The discourse, which blended zeal with charity and practical with doctrinal preaching, may be regarded as a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Bennett proposes to lay the gospel before the poor. Such a manner cannot fail of securing some success. If argument does not convince, a spirit of charity may conciliate and must improve those who are addressed. And if the

genuine spirit of Christian benevolence be increased in the district to which their exertions are directed, the Lancashire and Cheshire Missionary Society will greatly rejoice, even although the tenets which distinguish them from the rest of their Christian brethren may not meet with a reception equally extensive. Not that they are unsolicitous for the diffusion of their religious opinions, but if they cannot obtain all they wish, they rejoice to obtain a part. And they are persuaded that this part is the precursor of greater good. The operation of Christian love will prepare the way for the reception of Christian truth, and a pure heart will generally secure an enlightened understanding. In proportion as the *acrimonious spirit* of controversy disappears will the judgment lose its trammels, and it cannot but be sincerely wished by every real friend of Christianity that a disposition to denounce "those that oppose themselves," whether evinced in the conduct of reputed orthodox or reputed heretical preachers, and which is no other than priestcraft and ill-nature modified by the spirit of the times, may soon cease to diminish the efficacy of the principles of the mild and benevolent Jesus.

In the after-part of the day a meeting was held for the despatch of business in the school-room of the Unitarian Chapel, Mosley Street, the Rev. J. G. Robberds in the chair.

The proceedings were commenced by the chairman with a few excellent prefatory remarks explaining the nature and objects of the Society. The Secretary then read the report of the Committee during the last year; from which it appeared among other things, that the Society supplied six stations with the means of moral and intellectual improvement, and educated above 600 children in its Sunday-schools. Representatives from each of the stations were then called upon to furnish the meeting with an account of the state and prospects of Unitarian Christianity in their several neighbourhoods. They were kindly requested by the chairman to speak to the whole matter; not to Unitarianism as a system of belief merely, but to Unitarianism as a stimulus to duty also; to the practice as well as the profession of primitive Christianity. The statements of these humble and simple-minded persons afforded great pleasure to the audience. It appeared from the report that the Society is deficient in funds. This deficiency, it is hoped, will soon be sup-

plied; for whether the nature and objects of the Society be regarded, what it has effected and is effecting, or what it promises to effect, its success, it is presumed, will be felt to be intimately connected with the promotion of virtue, religion and happiness.

As the Society is desirous of the concurrence of every friend to the encouragement of pure Christianity and intellectual and moral excellence, and as many perhaps may have withheld their support for want of information respecting its nature and objects, the writer may be indulged in copying a few words from the report to explain them: "The leading object of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society is the diffusion of vital Christianity—of the worship of one God, as the Father of his creatures, and the love of Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. The unity and paternity of the Supreme Being its members feel to be the foundation and top-stone of all religion: and the reality of a future state as flowing from the fatherly love of a beneficent God, they know to be human nature's best solace and support. The reception of these glorious truths tends to purify, exalt and sustain the mind; and the proposal of them to the great body of the people might be expected to draw thousands from the profession of infidelity, and to calm others agitated by the influences of systems which place the criterion of acceptableness with God in frames and feelings as variable as the changeful day. To propose to more general acceptance the simple and affecting truths taught by Christianity, nine ministers of Manchester and its neighbourhood generously devote their gratuitous services. In their efforts they are seconded by several highly respectable persons, who though they may never have enjoyed the advantages of a collegiate education, have felt the power of Christianity in their own hearts, and are willing to make no few sacrifices to aid in imparting its blessings to their fellow-men

"Another object of the Society which may almost vie in importance with that which we have just mentioned, is the diffusion of knowledge generally, and more especially among the young. With this view its Committee recommends and assists the formation of libraries, and institutes, as well as aids to support, Sunday-schools at each of the stations visited by its preachers. The usefulness of the Sunday-schools patronized by the Society, may be estimated when it is considered that the congregations in connexion with which they are established, are mostly in places where even this means of information is difficult of ac-

cess. Your Society has frequently the gratification to teach those who otherwise would remain untaught; to infuse the love of virtue into bosoms which, without its fostering care, might be agitated by guilt and remorse; to transmit to children's children, to generations yet unborn, through these their immediate pupils, a veneration for God, for virtue, for Christianity. These labours are truly labours of love; they are lovely in themselves; it is the love of God that invites us to join in them, and their reward will be the possession of his love through the countless ages of an eternal world."

J. R. BEARD, Secretary.

Subscriptions will be thankfully received by the Rev. J. G. Robberds, Grosvenor Square, Manchester; or by the Secretary, 98, Green-Gate, Salford, Manchester.

Somerset and Dorset Unitarian Association.

THE Fourteenth Half-yearly Meeting of this Society was held at Bridport, on Good Friday, March 24, 1826. The introductory part of the morning service was performed by the Rev. Mr. Hughes, of Yeovil; the Rev. S. Fawcett, of Yeovil, delivered the long prayer, and Dr. Davies, of Taunton, gave a discourse "On the prohibition of Christ to be addressed in Prayer," from John xvi. 23.

At the close of the service the business of the Society was transacted, and a report read, of which the following are extracts: "To this brief account of the results which have attended their efforts, your Committee desire to add a few remarks. If a partial success only has attended these efforts in places where Unitarianism is not publicly professed, and where the establishment of new societies must be a work of time, it is fully evident that great advantages have resulted from the presence and exertions of your Missionaries to the established societies. The judicious zeal of many members of these societies has been called forth, and impressions highly favourable to our doctrines made upon strangers, who had previously no fixed opinions as to their real nature and tendency, or were violently prejudiced against them.

"Your Committee advert with peculiar satisfaction to the interest which the course of lectures, just concluded in Taunton, has excited in that populous town. Without the presence of a Missionary you must be aware this course of lectures could not have been delivered, and it is not too much to say, that the benefits to the congregation of that place and to the association generally, have not been purchased at too great a price.

“Considering all circumstances, your Committee are of opinion that, although the occasional employment of a missionary in the district is highly desirable, it is not at present necessary to employ one constantly. They confidently rely on your granting the needful pecuniary aid whenever it shall be deemed advisable to make exertions of this kind. It has been suggested, that such exertions may be made from time to time, in connexion with the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, which would gladly receive contributions and afford missionary assistance in return. Your Committee are persuaded that such a connexion will, under the Divine blessing, be productive of very beneficial results: they therefore strongly recommend the adoption of the measure in that mode which may be deemed most expedient; and in retiring from the post you assigned them, they cannot but express their confident assurance, in which they are persuaded you will cordially join with them, that the glorious system of redemption which began in the Divine benevolence, and is designed to promote the everlasting improvement and felicity of man, shall universally prevail.”

Among the resolutions passed on the occasion were these:

That the thanks of the Meeting be given to Dr. Davies for the very excellent discourse delivered by him this day.

That the Rev. E. Whitfield, of Ilminster, be appointed Secretary of the Society.

That the next General Meeting be held at Yeovil, on Tuesday, Sept. 19, and that the Rev. Mr. Lewes, of Dorchester, be requested to preach.

Upwards of forty members and friends of the Society dined together, and in the course of the afternoon appropriate sentiments and healths were given from the chair, which called forth some pleasing remarks. In particular, Mr. Wawne thanked his friends for their expressions of sympathy in a very interesting speech. The Report of the North Somerset, Wilts and Gloucester Association was also read.

The devotional part of the evening service was performed by Mr. Hughes; and Mr. Walker, of Crewkerne, preached from the words of Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 6, “To us there is but one God, the Father.”

To all the persons present the meeting was very interesting, and the visitors were alike gratified by witnessing the judicious zeal manifested by a flourishing congregation, and the attention with which strangers listened to the exposition of doctrines they had been taught to

regard as unchristian. May these doctrines, they are synonymous with truth, be received into honest hearts and bring forth much fruit!

E. WHITFIELD.

Somersetshire, Gloucestershire, and Wiltshire Unitarian Missionary Association.

THE third half-yearly General Meeting of this Association, was held at Frenchay, near Bristol, on Friday, March 24, when there were present friends from Bristol, Bath, Oakhill, Trowbridge, Calne, Taunton and Thornbury. The Rev. R. Wright read the Scriptures and engaged in prayer, and the solemnity, ardour, and impressiveness with which he performed this very important part of the religious service, commanded the fixed attention of the whole congregation and evidently produced a considerable effect. The Rev. Matthew Harding afterwards, delivered, in a very able manner, a judicious, argumentative, and interesting discourse from 2 Cor. xiii. 8: “We can do nothing against the truth but for the truth.” The preacher instituted an inquiry, What is Christian truth? This question he answered first negatively, and then affirmatively. In prosecuting this part of his subject, Mr. H. adduced reasons why the doctrines of the Trinity, the two natures of Christ, the personality of the Spirit, satisfaction for sin, election and reprobation, and the endless duration of future punishments, cannot be Christian truths; and why the unity, supremacy and exclusive Deity of the Father, the subordination of Christ, and the free mercy of God, must be. This was succeeded by very suitable observations upon the power of truth, the certainty of its final triumph, and the folly of attempting to impede its progress. The whole was closed with some most appropriate remarks upon the advantages of endeavouring to accelerate the progress of Christian truth; and the necessity imposed upon those who believe Unitarianism to be the “truth as it is in Jesus,” to unite zealously to disseminate these doctrines among mankind.

At the close of the service, Samuel Hobbs, Esq., was called to the Chair, and the Secretary read the Committee's Report of their proceedings for the last half-year. The Members and Friends of the Association, upwards of sixty in number, males and females, then repaired to the Bell Inn, Stapleton, where they partook together of an economical dinner. On the removal of the cloth, a hymn of thanksgiving was sung. Mr.

Harding, who filled the chair, then proceeded to propose several apposite sentiments, which drew forth remarks from Messrs. Wright, Browne, Clarke, Hyde, &c. The company continued together, enjoying the pure pleasures derived from such social, religious meetings, until six o'clock, when they separated highly gratified with the proceedings of the whole day.

H. C.

Anniversary of the Moor-Lane Chapel, Bolton.

THE Fourth Anniversary of the friends of Free Inquiry was held in *Moor-Lane Chapel, Bolton*, on Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, the 26th, 27th and 28th of March. The Rev. W. J. Bakewell, of Chester, preached in the morning and afternoon of Sunday; and the Rev. J. G. Robberds, of Manchester, in the evenings of Sunday and Monday; on which occasions, collections were made towards defraying the expense incurred by erecting the School-Rooms and Vestries adjoining the Meeting-House. On Monday, at one o'clock, the annual dinner took place, of which upwards of 120 persons partook. The Rev. W. SHEPHERD, of Liverpool, officiated as Chairman, and Mr. JOSHUA CROOK, Vice-President. Many liberal sentiments were given from the Chair, and many interesting addresses made by the Chairman and others, of which a fuller account, taken from the *Bolton Chronicle*, is inserted in the *Christian Reformer* of the present month.

At the conclusion of the meeting, a hymn was sung, and a prayer delivered, and the assembly retired to meet again at the Moor-Lane Chapel.

On Tuesday, about 100 of the Sunday-School scholars, with their teachers, sat down to dinner. When the cloth was removed, the President, the Rev. ROBERT CREE, of Preston, proposed the following sentiment, which he prefaced with a few observations: "Success to the cause of the general Education of the Poor." The children were then addressed by Mr. MAKIN, Mr. FINCH, of Liverpool, and Mr. HEYWOOD, the superintendent; in the course of which, the object and tendency of Sunday-Schools were dwelt upon, and the children exhorted to pursue that course of life most acceptable to their Creator, by emulating every virtuous action, and by being kind and charitable to each other, and consistent in their conduct as rational creatures. Mr. Cree eulogized, in high terms, Mechanics' Institutions, and proposed a toast, wish-

ing them success. After which, a hymn was sung, a benediction given by the Chairman, and the Meeting broke up.

Unitarian Anniversary, Portsmouth.

OUR Annual Social Meeting, on Good Friday, was this year held in the Assembly Room, over the National School, which was crowded with members and their friends, admitted by tickets issued by the appointed stewards.

The Rev. Russell Scott in acknowledging a vote of thanks to him as minister of the Unitarian congregation, expressed his satisfaction at seeing a continually increasing attendance on these occasions. Formerly our religious views were held in such abhorrence that our orthodox neighbours almost feared to associate with us in the usual pursuits of life; to-day we had the pleasure of seeing Christians of other persuasions come to witness and partake of our social enjoyments. He had been requested to publish a discourse he had recently delivered on several successive Sunday evenings, and part of it previously at the re-opening of the Chapel at Newport, being a summary narrative of the rise and progress of the Unitarian corruption of the gospel doctrine of Christ's humanity. He had complied, in hope that the attention of serious Trinitarians might thereby be called to the important fact, that the doctrine which they heard continually proclaimed to be now, "*as it was in the beginning*," was in reality of comparatively modern date, that it was the work of successive ages, and the several stages of its origin, growth and maturity can be distinctly traced. He was happy to find himself on this occasion supported by the presence of his respected friend the Rev. Joseph Brent, minister of the General Baptist Society, from whom, notwithstanding some shades of difference in sentiment, he had always found the most cordial willingness to co-operate in the good work to which the labours of both of them were directed. Nor did he feel less gratified by the presence of his truly valuable young friend, the Rev. Edmund Kell, who had entered on his engagement at Newport, with correct and becoming views of the ministerial character and office, had acted up to those views, and, under the Divine blessing, had the prospect of reaping a satisfactory harvest.

The Rev. Joseph Brent, in acknowledging a vote of thanks for his kindness in supplying Mr. Scott's pulpit during his recent illness, as well as on former occasions, spoke with great animation on the importance of Christian union.

The Rev. E. Kell took occasion to recommend perseverance in Sunday-school instruction. He found in his own congregation several exemplary members who owed their connexion with it entirely to the Sunday-school, commenced by one of his enlightened predecessors, the Rev. J. Tingcombe. A plan had recently been adopted at Newport of forming a school-library of instructive and interesting books, particularly a set published by the Irish School Union. The loan of a volume to the diligent scholar was found to be the most effectual stimulant to exertion; indeed it had brought their school into such reputation that they had more candidates for admission than they could possibly receive.

After several other members had contributed by their observations to the interest of the meeting, Mr. Beard, Sen., concluded its proceedings by proposing the following resolution, which was carried by acclamation: "That while, as Unitarians, we contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, we wish to do so in perfect charity with our fellow-Christians of other persuasions, and with good-will towards all mankind."

Select pieces of music were performed at intervals, which were appropriate, as well as tastefully performed.

D. B. P.

Ecclesiastical Preferments.

THE Right Rev. WM. VAN MILDERT, D. D., Bishop of *Landaff*, is translated to the rich see of *Durham*, vice Dr. *Barrington*, deceased.

C. R. SUMNER, D. D., one of the Chaplains in Ordinary to His Majesty, is promoted to the see of *Landaff* and the Deanery of *St. Paul's*, vacant by the translation of Dr. Van Mildert.

THE Annual Assembly of the *General Baptists* will be held on Whit-Tuesday, May 16th, at the Meeting-House, Worship Street, near Finsbury Square, London. Mr. Briggs, of Bessel's Green, near Sevenoaks, Kent, is expected to preach. Divine Service will commence at Eleven o'clock.

THE Annual Meeting of "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," will be held at the City of London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, on Saturday, May 13th, at Half-past Ten for Eleven o'clock precisely, when the Marquis of *Lansdowne* will preside.

THE Rev. G. KENRICK, Pastor of the Unitarian congregation, Maidstone, in compliance with the advice of his medical friends and the wishes of the society, is proceeding immediately to the Continent for twelve months for the re-establishment of his health. The Rev. BENJAMIN MARDON, M. A., is supplying his place. We mention this for the information of the Secretaries of Fellowship Funds, &c., whose letters should be addressed (for the present) to Mr. Mardon.

THE Rev. J. R. BEARD, Minister of the New Unitarian Chapel, Salford, Manchester, is just about to publish *Four Letters in Defence of the Historical Evidence of Christianity*, addressed to Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor.

PARLIAMENTARY.

IRISH CATHOLIC PETITIONS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

APRIL 14.

Mr. J. SMITH presented a petition from the Catholics of Ireland, which was adopted at a late aggregate meeting, and he must conclude that it represented the opinions of that body of the people, because the meeting was attended by several thousands. In stating the object of the petition he was necessarily led into some short detail. The petitioners complained that the education of the poor was not attended to of late years. Before the Reformation, the lands of the clergy were chargeable with the expense of educating their poor. Since that time a large portion of them had been partially educated at the expense of the Catholic body, the rest not at all. The petitioners professed to reason differently on their situation from the commissioners of Irish education. He himself thought that those commissioners had conducted themselves in a very exemplary manner, and that Parliament was greatly obliged to them. They, however, recommended that Catholics and Protestants should be educated in the same schools, and that the schoolmaster should be chosen from the religion professed by the majority. This was a comparatively moderate proposal. He himself objected, however, to forcing people to read any book; and in the case in question, the petitioners pointed out a difficulty; which was, that they could not read any books without first obtaining leave from the consistory and the approbation of the Bishop. They complained that the House granted mo-

ney to societies whose views were not those of education, but of proselytism. The House did certainly owe to the commissioners their thanks for a clear and distinct examination into that subject. He was of opinion that some of those societies were particularly anxious about converting people to their own faith. He did not extend the whole force of this remark to the Kildare-Street Society. There was in his mind nothing more unjust and illiberal and intolerable, than to force people to read books they did not like, whether the Bible or any other. He had seen an instance of a most distressing kind in his travels. The Jews were, in France, put under very disagreeable restraints. In the reign of Louis XVIII. they were not allowed to use any books in their public schools but such as were approved by the Congregation. He lamented as much as any man the credulity and ignorance in which the greater part of the Catholic world were held; yet he contended that it was against common sense and toleration to compel them to read the Scriptures. The education of the Irish poor ought to be allowed to proceed, if not in the way most pleasing to Parliament, in their own way. Something else, however, was wanting. Those who went upon religious missions into the utmost bounds of the East and West, took another course. They began with teaching civilization. They shewed the savage how to plant corn and to breed poultry, and to secure the return of the fruits in their season. After conciliating them by kindness, they were able to go on prosperously with the culture of religion. The effect was, that they brought men of that rude and savage nature at their feet. In like manner, if they would convert Ireland, they must first subdue her by kindness. How could the rude and half barbarous people of that country understand the great moralities of a Church establishment, to which they had only to contribute rates and pay tithes? They must rather be enraged at the riches of the Establishment, and the poverty of their own clergy. Unfortunately, all circumstances conspired against the improvement of that people. In the examination instituted by the commissioners of education, a Captain Gordon was asked if he had not been active in proselytism? His answer was, Certainly not: he only wished to see established veritable Christianity. He was then asked, concerning this and that particular sect, if he thought their belief veritable Christianity. His reply was, that he believed the Roman Catholic religion to be any thing but veritable Christianity. Thus the cause of

religion and education sustained continual injury from the spirit of controversy. The petitioners prayed for a fair division of the money appropriated to Irish education by Parliament, and that they might be allowed to conduct that education in their own way. This he could not but consider as a very reasonable request, and a measure which promised to be safe and beneficial. Nothing was so desirable as that the people of Ireland should be educated. All the evils, all the commotions, riot and bloodshed, which disgraced that country were owing to a deficiency of education. The same thing was observable in London. The outrages in the streets, the savageness and depravity which were so shocking to better-informed people, which led the unhappy culprits to shed their blood upon the scaffolds, were perpetrated by wretches who were trained and preserved in ignorance, and who never experienced offices of kindness and friendship from any human being; if they had, they would have been humanized. It was scarcely to be credited now, yet it was matter of authentic history, that religious education in England was once at so low an ebb, that it required Irish interference to assist it. It was most certainly true that Ireland first, of all these islands, received the light of the gospel. He strongly recommended the prayer of the petition to the House.

MR. BUTTERWORTH said, that as friends of the Government, of the State, and of the word of God, which was strictly interwoven with the constitution, they were bound to refuse the prayer of this petition. The people of Ireland were not disinclined to receive the Bible. The priests alone prevented its reception. But for them, education would go on well in that country. They prevented the spreading of truth and of morality—they encouraged disorder and opposition to the laws, and the disturbance of the public peace of Ireland. Why should they want the benevolence of Parliament? If they earnestly desired the good of the people, according to their own account they must be very well able to effect it. They boasted that they could raise £1,000 a week for projects of sedition and designs against the State. If they possessed proper feelings of benevolence, they would far more readily contribute that much for the education of their poor. The priests had had the controul of that country for ages. What had they done? Compare Scotland and Ireland in point of education; what a contrast! The modes of education were different. In Scotland the Scriptures were the basis of

education, and they inculcated the highest sense of morality, of justice, of obedience to the laws, and of respect for one another. It was not a fit thing for Parliament to vote money to be laid out in educating the people in a system which put them in hostility to the religion of the State. He declared openly, and he wished others to do the same, his zeal for proselytism. What then? Were they to be frightened at the sound of a word? It was proselytism from ignorance and vice to morality and knowledge. What should hinder a man of sense from being anxious for such a change? He repeated his conviction that money ought not to be granted for educating people in a religion hostile to the State. The Reformation was glorious in this respect—that it gave back the Scriptures to the laity. He had great faith in it, because many great men suffered death for its sake, and he could not believe that they died in error. If they were friends to that Reformation, if they were foes to immorality, to fraud, delusion, tyranny and disorder, they would now refuse the prayer of this petition.

Mr. W. SMITH differed almost wholly from the last speaker. No man could stand more remote from the doctrines of the Roman Church than he did. He was a friend to truth, and to the inquiry by which alone it could be brought to light: but in selecting it for himself, he must take care not to assume the right of judging for others. It was this error on the part of Popery that led on the Reformation, which of all Christian systems he was bound to admit contributed most to the well-being of society. He considered the circumstances of Ireland to be most unfortunate, and her situation a most shocking disgrace—a disgrace to her gentry and nobility—a disgrace to England, who had governed her so long, and to the character of her inhabitants. In order to prove the wretchedness and degradation to which the Irish peasantry were reduced, he had taken the pains to collect from the various Irish newspapers a number of stories, which he could assure the House, presented the most appalling pictures of misery and crime. The Hon. Member for Dover (Mr. Butterworth) had instanced the case of France as illustrative of the misery of infidelity; but the present state of that country afforded any thing but a picture of internal wretchedness. He thought the Honourable Member was peculiarly unhappy in his illustration, and it was not correct to ascribe the Revolution which had taken place in France, to any general feeling of infidelity that influenced the people of

that country, for it was well known that the Revolution was effected through the plots and machinations of a few determined individuals.

Mr. C. WILSON said, that any system of education which excluded the reading of the Scriptures, should always meet with his determined disapprobation.

Mr. G. BANKES most earnestly desired to see the Scriptures promulgated throughout Ireland. He wished to see the Bible in the hands of the Irish peasant, and he denounced that intolerant spirit by which it was endeavoured to be withheld. The present state of Ireland he considered was owing to the bigotry of the Catholic priests, and the greatest disgrace in consequence was reflected on that body.

Colonel TRENCH said, that the Hon. Member for Dover, and those who advocated his principles, had done considerable injury to the cause of truth by their injudicious and mischievous interference. It was wrong to attach to the Irish people a sweeping stigma of bigotry, and it was not true that they blindly followed their priests, for it was well known to those who had intercourse with Ireland, that a spirit of information had gone forth among the people; and were it not for priests and enthusiasts who kept down and denounced that spirit, Ireland would now reap the benefit of the increased improvement of her people. But for that mischievous society in Dublin, which took upon itself the government of the Irish people, the children of the peasantry would have had the advantages resulting from a liberal education.

Mr. MAURICE FITZGERALD saw nothing in the petition under discussion which could at all warrant the extreme rancour displayed by the member for Dover. A meddling set of Sectarians had established themselves in Ireland, and set up a system of bigotry and intolerance, sowing the seeds of discord wherever they spread themselves, and sounding unnecessary alarm on the most trifling occasions. (Hear, hear.) It was natural that the Catholic clergy should be aroused when they saw their rights invaded, and it was no wonder if they had endeavoured to counteract the influence of that meddling sect. The Catholic clergy, that much calumniated body, with their scanty means, had effected more towards the education of the Catholic population of Ireland than the state, with all its exuberant liberality, had accomplished for the various sects in that country. (Hear, hear.) It was to the sectarians that the religious divisions of Ireland might be traced: those outrageous zealots, who wished to pull down

Popery on the one hand, and by opposing Episcopacy, the Established religion on the other. (Hear, hear.)

The petition was then brought up and read.

On the question that it do lie on the table,

Mr. J. SMITH said, that all the petitioners claimed was, the right of putting into the hands of their children at school such books as they considered most proper for their understanding. This was but fair, and ought not in reason to be refused to them.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH, after repeating some of his former arguments, observed that as long as the great mass of the people in Ireland were allowed to remain in ignorance, the Roman Catholics were quiet, for ignorance best suited their purposes; but the moment it was attempted to give education, the priests rose up to oppose it, and in their efforts to follow up that opposition, they were the cause of all the mischiefs that occurred in Ireland. They intruded themselves into Bible meetings to which they were not invited, and were the occasion of much disturbance, on some occasions attended with no little danger to the promoters of such meetings. He could give one instance in which at a public Bible meeting at Carlow, the priests attended supported by an immense mob, from whose violence some of the friends of the Bible Society were obliged to fly with their lives; some escaped by getting over walls. (Some cries of "No, no.")

Mr. BUTTERWORTH.—I say Yes, yes; and I can prove the fact, if required.

Sir J. NEWPORT said it was not his intention to have offered any observation on the petition before the House, but after what had just fallen from the last speaker, he could not remain silent. The Honourable Member alluded to a Bible meeting which was held in Carlow. Now he would state that the circumstances mentioned by the Honourable Member connected with that meeting, were wholly without foundation (hear, hear); and he was enabled to contradict them on most excellent authority—that of Colonel Rochford, who presided at the meeting on the occasion. That most respectable gentleman, who was most deservedly respected by all parties, had stated in his evidence before the committee on the state of Ireland, that the accounts given of the proceedings at that meeting, and which the Honourable Member (Mr. Butterworth) had just repeated, were misrepresentations of the real facts. So much for the accuracy of the Honourable Member's

information on these subjects. As to the assertion that the Catholics excluded the reading of the Bible, he confidently stated from his own knowledge that it was utterly destitute of truth. They admitted the reading of the Bible, with the addition of notes and comments; and in this they were borne out by the opinions of some of the most eminent dignitaries of the Established Church, who held that the Bible ought not to be read unaccompanied with the Catechism. (Hear, hear.) It was extremely illiberal and unjust for any individual to be attributing to the Roman Catholics principles and opinions which they had so often and so solemnly disavowed.

The petition was ordered to lie on the table.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

APRIL 17, 1826.

THE Marquis of LANSDOWNE rose, pursuant to the notice he had given, to present a petition from the Roman Catholics of Ireland. Although the petition which he then had to ask their Lordships' permission to lay before them, was similar to those which had on other occasions been submitted to their consideration, he could not propose to place it on the table without saying a few words in reference to it—not, however, with the view of raising any controversial argument, which it was certainly far from his wish to do on a subject which had so often been, and must again soon be, discussed. But the present petition having been placed in his hands, in consequence of an event which all in that House deplored—the loss of a Noble Lord whose services had long been devoted to the cause of the petitioners, who, from the commencement to the close of his life, had been connected with this great question, of which he continued to the last moment of his existence the able and disinterested advocate; their Lordships would excuse him for reminding them of that circumstance. Notwithstanding that the grave had closed over that Noble Lord, and many more devoted to the support of the same cause, who had, like him, been compelled to transmit to others their unfinished task—as it also had closed over millions of the people whose just claims had thus been advocated, those claims would never fail to be renewed, as long as there continued among the people of Ireland a just sense of the rights which they ought, in common with their fellow-subjects, to enjoy—as long as the Catholics continued to feel, and God for-

bid they ever should cease to feel, the disadvantage of their exclusion from the privileges of their Protestant countrymen, and which they would not experience if they lived under any other Protestant Government. Having said thus much, he did not think it expedient to do more than to move that the petition be laid on the table; but he still felt it to be a duty he owed to the petitioners to observe, that, indulgent as he knew the House, and even those of their Lordships who were hostile to the claims of the Catholics, would always be to any language which might be employed by persons in pursuit of rights of which they conceived themselves to be unjustly deprived, and which, their Lordships would admit proceeded from no improper or dishonourable motive; yet he was happy to say, that in perusing this petition he had found nothing in it which would require the kind of indulgence to which he had alluded—nothing which was unworthy of the petitioners, and nothing which could call for the animadversion of their Lordships. He was also happy to have the opportunity of stating, that the petitioners had, with great propriety, abstained from any thing like polemical discussion. They had introduced into their petition none of those theological questions which, however proper in the pulpit, or in learned dissertations from the press, he never wished to see agitated within the walls of that House. They had, with great propriety, confined themselves to answering the allegation that they were unfit to enjoy the same privileges as the other subjects of his Majesty. He meant the allegation that they could not give an undivided allegiance. This incapacity they solemnly disclaimed. To the pledge thus given, he trusted their Lordships would pay that attention which it deserved at their hands. He would not trespass farther on their Lordships' time, than to say, that he concurred in the sentiments expressed by the petitioners, and to express his hope that a period would soon arrive when those sentiments would be more generally adopted by that House. The question was one, the consideration of which could not be avoided, for he was sure it would force itself again on that House until justice was done to the claims of the petitioners. The petition was read and laid on the table.

The Noble Marquis then rose and presented another petition from a great number of the principal Protestants of Ireland in favour of the Catholic claims. Among the names attached to it were

those of the Duke of Leinster, the Marquis of Downshire, the Earl of Portarlington, and many other noblemen and great landed proprietors. Their Lordships, in receiving this petition, would hear from those distinguished persons, in their own words, how deeply they considered themselves and their property to be affected by the existence of those laws which excluded their Catholic fellow-subjects from the participation of the privileges which they themselves enjoyed.

Earl GREY had to call their Lordships' attention to a petition from the same body as that with which the first petition presented by his Noble Friend originated, and which could not have been intrusted to the care of a more zealous and able advocate. His Noble Friend had that day shewn that his zeal for the cause which he espoused was tempered by the soundest discretion, in refraining from doing any thing more than to make the usual motion for laying the petition on the table. It was his intention to follow the same course as that which had been adopted by his Noble Friend—namely, to require of their Lordships nothing more than to permit this petition to be laid on their table; but in doing this he also wished, in common with his Noble Friend, to express his opinion that civil disqualification on religious grounds, if not founded on a paramount public necessity, could not be maintained on any principle of policy or justice; and that upon the accomplishment of the object of the petitioners, the peace and prosperity of Ireland, and therewith the security and power of the British empire, depended. But, concurring as he did with his Noble Friend that it would at present be inexpedient to trouble their Lordships by calling their immediate attention to these topics, he must state, with his Noble Friend, that this question was of such a nature, so vitally connected with the interests of the nation, that it must, to use his words, force itself again and again on their consideration. He, therefore, looked forward with an anxious hope to a time, and that not distant, when, under his auspices, this question would be taken up and pursued to a successful issue. Having said thus much, it was now his duty to advert to the particular object of the petition which he had the honour to present to their Lordships. The petitioners expressed their deep sense of the injury they suffered from the disqualifications under which they laboured on account of their religious opinions. They stated that they had endeavoured

at various times, and through various channels, to remove the unfavourable and unjust impressions which existed against them. With this view they had associated and formed that body which was called the Catholic Association—an association formed on sound and constitutional principles, and in the institution of which they were warranted by the precedents and practice of the best times of British history. They complained, that against this association a bill was introduced. The allegations of that bill they offered to refute, and prayed to be heard at the bar for that purpose; but this prayer was refused. They therefore complain, that, without examination or inquiry, that bill was passed into a law. By that law the petitioners felt themselves deeply aggrieved, and they had stated in strong terms, but not in such as would render it unfit for him to present the petition to the House, their sense of the injury they had sustained. They concluded their petition by praying their Lordships to repeal the law. After this statement, it only remained for him to fulfil his duty by moving that the petition be laid on the table. Before he made that motion, however, he would, in order to save time, beg leave to present another petition, which was from the Catholic inhabitants of the parish of St. Audeon, in Dublin. The object of this petition was Catholic emancipation, and on that general subject it was not neces-

sary for him to make any further observation. But the petitioners requested their Lordships' attention to a particular point—to those proposed measures which were known by the name of wings, but which, he concurred with the petitioners, did not assist the cause in its upward flight; for, instead of enabling it to soar, they clogged and impeded it. To these measures he had strong objections, particularly to that one which went to disfranchise a large body of electors upon the allegation of abuse—to deprive freeholders of the right to elect representatives—a right which they held under the same sanction of British law by which all other rights and property were protected. He was not at all surprised that those persons who had always opposed Catholic emancipation should take up this particular clause of disfranchisement for the purpose of defeating that measure, to the principle of which they objected. He agreed with the sentiments expressed in the petition on this point as well as on its general object. There was no question, the consideration of which was so essential to the peace and security of this empire, as that of the continuance of those laws, as unjust as they were unwise, which excluded Roman Catholics from the privileges enjoyed by other British subjects.

The petitions were read and laid on the table.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Communications have been received from Messrs. Bristowe; Noah Jones; and Brettell; from Theophilus; Rusticus; a Free-Thinker; and C.; and the Verses from Kendal.

The legal argument on the Trust-Deed of the Chapel at Merthyr Tydfil would not, we apprehend, be intelligible to the mass of our readers.

"The Oldest Subscriber" has completely mistaken our design in the insertion of the passages from Mr. Huskisson's and Mr. Canning's speeches in the last number. Our object was not political, much less to give our humble countenance to "the Pitt system", but solely to shew the progress of the age, and to point out Ministers of State as the eulogists of "philosophy," (so much abused,) and of reform (so long dreaded).

We are constrained to defer to the next number the Obituary of the late *Ebenezer Johnston*, Esq., of Lewes.

We are again obliged, by some recent instances of inadvertence, to remind our Correspondents that communications must be addressed [*post-paid*] to the EDITOR, at the *Publishers'*, Messrs. Sherwood & Co., Paternoster Row.

ERRATUM.

P. 172, line 30 from the bottom, [col. 1.] read "*Boreæ*."
